



THE ENTRANCE  
TO THE VINAYA

VINAYAMUKHA VOL. I

วินัยมุข เล่ม ๑

# THE ENTRANCE TO THE VINAYA



## VINAYAMUKHA

### VOLUME ONE

of

Somdetch Phra Mahā Samāṇa Chao  
Krom Phrayā Vajirañāṇavarorasa  
10th Saṅgharāja of the Ratanakosin Era  
of Siam

MAHĀMAKUṬARĀJAVIDYĀLAYA  
King Mahā Makuta's Academy  
Bangkok 2512/1969



## THAI EDITIONS OF VINAYAMUKHA

1st Edition 2459 — 1,000 copies.  
27th Edition 2508 — 30,000 copies.

*( Altogether 241,000 copies in Thai )*

1st English Edition 2512 — 2,000 copies.

## TRANSLATORS' NOTE

The square brackets [ ] found in the text contain the explanations of the Venerable Author. Rounded brackets ( ) contain expansions of the original necessary in some places due to its brevity, or for translating difficult Pāli and Thai idioms.

## Copyright

is held by

MAHĀMAKUṬARĀJAVIDYĀLAYA  
KING MAHĀ MAKUTA'S ACADEMY

## FOREWORD

There are many books in the Thai language explaining *Dhamma* (Buddhist teachings) and *Vinaya* (Monastic Discipline), both together being called the *Buddhasāsana* (the Buddhist religion). In particular, many of these books are used in the syllabus of Buddhist studies because Thailand has long accepted and had faith in the *Buddhasāsana* so there have been many learned men some of whom have composed various sorts of books in the course of time. In the recent past, Somdetch Phra Mahā Samāṇa Chao Krom Phrayā Vajirañāṇavarorasa has written a great number of volumes which have been used in the Nak Dhamma course (for monks and novices) and the Dhammasikṣā course (for laypeople) up to the present time. Mahāmakut Buddhist University has taken steps to have these books translated while Mahamakuta-rājavidyālaya Foundation has already published many of them such as *Dhammavicaraṇa* (Introspection in the Dhamma) and *Pañcasīla-pañcadhamma* (The Five Precepts and Five Ennobling Qualities), and so forth.

The reason for making these translations into English is that now there are many foreigners giving increasing attention to the *Buddhasāsana* so that ever-greater numbers of them try coming to Thailand for ordination as *bhikkhus* (monks) thus furthering their studies. Contacts between people having faith in the *Buddhasāsana* in various countries have now increased greatly, while English is the tongue known to many people throughout the world so that it is now used as the international language. Thai *bhikkhus* have tried to study English and many other supporting subjects for ease of contact in spreading knowledge of the *Buddhasāsana*. For this purpose, a university for *bhikkhus* has been



established. Therefore, it is proper and necessary to translate Buddhist works into English. We have the intention to translate fully all the books on the syllabus of Nak Dhamma and Dhammasikṣā in every grade. This book, Vinayamukha Volume One (translated as "The Entrance to the Vinaya") is one of the volumes which have been newly translated and printed in the present time. The Introduction by the Venerable Author of the Vinayamukha explains the need for such a work. In the work of translation, Phra Khantipālo and Mr. Suchin co-operated from the Rains-residence in 2510, being completed in this year, 2512. Mahāmakuta-rājavidyālaya has also arranged to have the *Pāṭimokkha* (the Fundamental Rules of a bhikkhu) printed with English translation (now in its second edition).

Persons who are not familiar with the subject of the *Sangha* (monastic community) in the Buddhasāsana, do not know why bhikkhus can do this but cannot do that, nor how bhikkhus should conduct themselves. And what will be the proper way for laypeople to practise towards bhikkhus? But when they have read this Vinayamukha they will know about matters which are really important, called 'the training in the life of purity' and they will see how meticulously this work treats upon the *Vinaya* (monastic discipline). To one who has been ordained, it shows how to practise the Vinaya fully and properly.

This Vinaya is regarded by the Sangha in the *Theravāda* (the way of the Elders) as the main root of the Buddhasāsana and they maintain firmly that the Vinaya should not be changed or given up, thus according with the ruling laid down by the *Theras* (elder monks) in the First Great Council. The Sangha belonging to the school adhering to this, is called Theravāda.

One who has read this book, or even the (brief) *Pāṭimokkha*, will come to know the Buddhist ordinances which are the original and true ones. And they may be surprised, for how can these be used even up to the present? Which books of worldly law indeed

have been used for longer than 2500 years, and which are still as fully valid as the training-rules laid down in the Vinaya by the the Exalted Buddha?

Mahāmakuta-rājavidyālaya would like to express their appreciation to Phra Khantipālo and to Mr. Suchin who were the translators, and to others who gave assistance in every way.

*Phra Sāsana Sobhaṇa (Suvaḍḍhano)*  
*Director, Mahāmakutarājavidyālaya.*

Wat Bovoranives Vihāra.  
1st October, B.E. 2512.





SOMDETC PHRA MAHĀ SAMĀṆA CHAO

KROM PHRAYĀ VAJIRANĀṆAVARORASA

who worked so hard for the progress of knowledge in Buddhism.



**SOMDETC PHRA MAHĀ SAMANA CHAO**  
**KROM PHRAYĀ VAJIRANĀNAVARORASA**

One of the royal children of His Majesty King Mongkut, His Royal Highness Prince *Vajirañāṇavarorasa*, the tenth Sangharāja of the present *Ratanakosin* period, was born on 12th April B.E. 2402. It was said that at the time of his birth the clear blue sky became suddenly overcast and there burst forth a heavy rain which soon inundated the palace grounds. His royal father, taking this as a prophetic omen of cool and delight associated with his birth, named him *Manussanāga*, referring to an event that took place soon after Lord Buddha's Enlightenment. This was when He sat in the rain absorbed in an ecstatic contemplation of the reality of his Enlightenment. A *Nāga* King, impressed by the sight, came to offer protection by spreading his hood over the Buddha's head and coiling himself around the Buddha's body. The term *Nāga*, besides meaning 'Serpent', also refers to an elephant, which is symbolic of strength and endurance and is one of the epithets of Lord Buddha and the Arahants.

Brought up as a royal prince, he was educated by the best teachers that could be found. Besides studying Thai and Pāli, he was among the first group of royal children who studied English under Mr. Francis John Patterson, a serious teacher who was strict in enforcing discipline as well as earnest in teaching English. But with his patience and intelligence, Prince *Manussanāga*, together with Prince *Diswara* (or Prince Damrong, pioneer in the field of Thai history and archaeology), become the teacher's most favorite pupils. This English teacher had also been His Majesty's tutor for some time.

He entered the Sangha at the age of twenty and after this dedicated all his time and energy to studying the Holy Scriptures until he was well versed in the Dhamma and was able to teach all



grades of Pali classes at that time. But it was long before he was appointed Sangharāja with full power and responsibility to manage ecclesiastical affairs. After becoming Sangharāja he never wasted his time in seeking personal comfort or relaxation. On the contrary, he worked indefatigably to improve the level of knowledge and the standard of behaviour of bhikkhus at that time. There were not many bhikkhus who had a sound basis of knowledge or a reasonable faith consistent with the spirit of Buddhism. Buddhist education was then rather an individual affair, with each taking the subjects he liked in the way he pleased. Most were satisfied with what had been traditionally handed down and were practically unable to distinguish the special characteristics of Buddhism from other faiths. Thus in many cases they preferred only the superficial aspect of the truth, with a consequent laxity in Vinaya and ignorant distortion of the Dhamma. Even the way bhikkhus preached was haphazard and the language used was generally too old or too high to appeal intelligently to the ordinary mind. The examination procedure in Buddhist education was still conducted orally and individually, there being yet no written examination. This method, besides being a very tiring job to both the students and the examiners themselves, was very slow and could not cope with the ever-growing number of students each year. Seeing this disadvantage he introduced the method of written examination, which saves time and yields more accurate results.

Apart from laying down several more courses of Buddhist study in the new style both for bhikkhus and laymen, his literary output was also enormous. This includes works of varied nature both in Pali and Thai, being text-books, sermons, addresses, translations, explanations and discussion or comments. Some of them were composed specially for bhikkhus, dealing with the subtle aspect of the truth, whereas others were prepared for laymen, concerning the lower grade of the truth suitable to their immediate need and condition. As for those in the form of a comment, there



is this valuable work named "The Entrance to the Vinaya" (ဝိနည်းဝင်). This is a set of three volumes, full of interesting facts concerning the *Vinaya* or Monastic Discipline based on documentary evidence with a good collection of reasons and arguments. It is an exhaustive work with a detailed and enlightening discussion of each article of the *Pāṭimokkha* (Bhikkhu's Discipline), reflecting the author's extensive research, penetrating insight and a spirit of tolerance that cannot always be found combined in so great a personage.

All this, however, shows only his benevolent achievement in the field of Buddhist education. In the realm of administration, the products of his pioneering spirit and democratic character born of his discernment are by no means less significant. But with the space at our disposal it is practically impossible to mention in detail what he had selflessly done for the sake of the development of Buddhism in his country. Suffice it to say that the situation of Buddhism when he took leave of us was far different from the one when he took over. His heritage, in the form of a much improved method of administration within the Sangha and that of hundreds of valuable books still loved today as they were in his time, is and shall be a living witness of his great life and work, with his name and memory for ever revered by the coming generations, as well as by the present one.

As a Sangharāja he willingly devoted his life to the progress of Buddhism and the welfare and happiness of the bhikkhus all over the land. As a bhikkhu he regarded himself as a member of the Sangha who was allowed no special privilege as far as the *Vinaya* was concerned and who, in spite of his birth and authority, was friendly, accessible and informal to everyone. As a scholar no cost was ever spared by him to raise the standard of study and practice in his land. The compilation of hundreds of literary works, some of which were completed at the expense of his own health, is plain evidence of this noble virtue.



Then came the time when his sojourn in this physical existence was to end. This was on the 2nd August B.E. 2464, when he realized that his death would soon take place. In fact he had known even before that time that his illness was to be his last. So he committed his body to the doctor's care, never once making any complaint. But inside he was dwelling constantly in his mind on the essential Buddhist teaching of Impermanence, Dukkha and Ownerlessness. Thus, in spite of his sufferings and exhaustion he managed to keep his mind peaceful and indifferent to the condition of the coarse, physical body until his end, which he readily welcomed, in the same manner as his august father King Mongkut, with the following last words of his own:—

<b>Saṅkhārā aniccā</b>	<b>Vipariṇāmadhammā</b>
	<b>Santati paṭibaddhā</b>
<b>Saṅkhārā dukkhā</b>	<b>Taṃ kutettha labbhā</b>
<b>Saṅkhārā anattā</b>	<b>Yathāpaccayaṃ pavattanti</b>

Conditions (of mind and body) are unstable,  
things sure to deteriorate,  
bound about in continuity.

Conditions (of mind and body) are dukkha  
what else could be expected of them?

Conditions (of mind and body) are ownerless  
going on according to supporting factors.

## PREFACE

We bhikkhus are a well-founded community controlled by rule, regulation and tradition like other well-founded races and communities. Now, the rules, regulations and traditions of bhikkhus are called the *Vinaya*, which is paired with the *Dhamma*, the latter being the training of the heart. Both of them comprise the *Sāsana* which is therefore called the *Dhamma-Vinaya*. It is said that Phra Upāli Thera was an expert in Vinaya having studied it in the presence of the Exalted Buddha who praised him as preeminent among those who knew Vinaya, there being no other bhikkhu to surpass him. When the Exalted Buddha had attained Parinibbāna, in that very Rains-residence, many of the Theras presided over by Phra Mahākassapa Thera assembled together to rehearse the Dhamma-Vinaya thereby arranging the order of the Buddhasāsana to become the principles for all, at Rājagaha the royal capital of Magadha. During that rehearsal, in the part which was devoted to the Vinaya, Phra Mahākassapa questioned Phra Upāli who answered those questions and when all this was clear, it was declared to be the pattern to be practised and learnt by heart, to be taught orally to others and to be handed down. In this way knowledge of the Vinaya was passed from generation to generation for many hundreds of years after the Parinibbāna until it was written down. During that time there were misunderstandings from time to time and the Theras of those times assembled to consider disputes and their decisions were also handed down as tradition. The pattern (of the Sāsana) arranged by the Venerable rehearsing Theras was called *Pāli* which those who have studied believe is the text (and language) used from the very beginning and remembered without mistakes. Those present at the first *Sangāyana* or rehearsal were the great disciples of the Exalted Buddha himself, being erudite in His Teaching, moreover they were men of purity for they were Arahants.



The Commentaries explaining the meaning of the Pāli written by later Ācariyas, are called *Atthakathā* (talks upon the meaning) which since they have second place to the Pāli, are held in less esteem. Nevertheless, since these writers knew the Exalted Buddha's Teachings they can be believed.

Still later, those works written explaining the Commentaries or supplementing them, are called *Tikā*, while books adding further information to the latter are known as *Anutikā*. *Tikā* and *Anutikā* since they contain the ideas of various later Ācariyas, can be trusted less. Other books written individually by Ācariyas according to their own ideas, are not included (in this series from Pāli to *Anutikā*) and each of them is held to be the words of those Ācariyas (*Ācariyavāda*).

According to my own investigation, it may be concluded that the first Sangāyana was a Sangha-assembly where there was only the questioning and investigating of the words of the Exalted Buddha, both those on Dhamma and those on Vinaya. Those words which were approved of generally or by a majority of bhikkhus were then held to be trustworthy and afterwards handed down. In later times when differences of understanding arose and when explanations on unclear points were needed, the Theras of those times again assembled to rehearse and then decided and laid down from time to time an agreed measure, until all of it was written down; therefore it was possible to explain extensively in writing. The action of handing down without writing is seen in the recent example of Dhammayuttika tradition. Since the time when Phra Chom Klao (King Mahāmakut) was a bhikkhu, to the present time (2456) sixty years have elapsed during which this tradition has been handed down by practice from teacher to pupil without having been written down except the original texts of Vinaya and Dhamma and those books of Pāli to be learnt by heart. It is apparent that the purity and the principles of the original Pāli are not as important as we



formerly believed. The fact that it was added to later in some places can be shown thus: the *Pāṭimokkha* Pāli called *Mātika* is said in the *Suttas* to contain 150 training rules, without *Aniyata* and *Sekhiyavatta* which were added later than the arrangement of that *Sutta*, while in the *Vibhaṅga* Pāli, the elaboration of the training-rules in the *Pāṭimokkha*, mentions the things offered to a *cetiya* showing that this Pāli is added later when the *cetiyas* had become sacred and people became accustomed to making offerings to them. Again, in the *Khandhaka*-book are mentioned the First and Second *Saṅgāyanas* which show the lateness of this addition. There is also laid down the procedure for conduct during a schism (of the *sangha*) but this is not at all the Buddha's behaviour, for teachers truly should try to reconcile schismatic disciples. He would not set up the method of opening the way to schism, so that it can be seen that this was written later when schism had actually taken place. Particularly, this may have been when the *bhikkhus* of *Mahāvihāra* and *Abhayagirivihāra* in Ceylon created schism. The action of writing down does not seem to have been undertaken by people who were pure and fully aware, because there are apparent instances of carelessness. This can be shown thus: in *Vibhaṅga* Pāli the writer was not sure whether the Pāli should come from Lord Buddha's mouth or from his own so that there is an inner conflict. Such grave carelessness is seen in the *Vibhaṅga* elaborations upon (the training-rule dealing with) an old rug (*Nissaggiya Pācittiya*, *Kosiya-vagga* 5) where the writer has said that it has been 'worn' only once. Now the rug is used for sitting on, not for wearing, its colour also being different from that of the robe. The reason why the writer has asserted a rug to be old in this way is that he first commented on the old robe (*Nissaggiya Pācittiya*, *Civāra-vagga* 4) saying that this was old after 'wearing' below and above only once, so that when he came to the old rug, he copied the above without careful consideration. There are more of such mistakes some of which are brought to light in the course of this book.



With regard to the Commentaries and Sub-commentaries, it is not necessary here to point out (careless mistakes) because they are Ācariyavāda. Whether we believe them or not depends upon our own careful consideration.

In the Vinaya itself which was handed down for a long time both orally and by writing, differences of understanding naturally have crept in at the time when the Ācariyas who understood incorrectly, wrote it down. When its rehearsal was undertaken at the time of a Sangāyana the mistakes could be removed but since the Vinaya was written down these remained in the sacred books and nobody could eliminate them. It is understood that the later Sangāyanas were held in individual countries only for the purpose of correcting mistakes in spelling. With regard to the later books, their writers do not consider the essence of the sacred books but only translate the meaning from Magadhi language into their own national tongues. They arranged their subjects according to their individual preferences, Pubbasikkhāvāṇṇanā being an example of this.

The complications found in the Vinaya bring about two results. (1) Those who are not strict are not encouraged to practise and, this being so, it will not be possible to control the Sangha of bhikkhus successfully. (2) Those who are strict will observe (the Vinaya) blindly thinking that they are better than the others whom they will blame regarding trivial points concerned with tradition, thus making annoyance for themselves when they enter a meeting. As it is, there will be no result of happiness for those who practise. It has been said that one benefit of the Vinaya is absence of annoyance but the opposite result, that is, remorse, will be experienced (by these falsely 'strict' bhikkhus).

From this discussion of how the Vinaya has come down to us, I feel disturbed and as a result I have planned to write this book, the Vinayamukha, with the purpose of pointing out the advantages



of Vinaya for fellow-practisers of the same Dhamma-Vinaya, desiring that they shall be well established in correct practice. Those who are not strict will then be convinced and train themselves in the etiquette of a samāṇa; while those who are excessively strict will no longer practise blindly, ceasing to be conceited and not blaming others, and even leading others to practise in a good way so that there will be the advantage of no remorse.

To prevent worries and confusion arising from the sight of huge heaps of āpatti which cannot be escaped from, I adopt from the Pāli the method of dividing Vinaya into two groups: *Ādibrahmacārikāsikkhā* (the principal training in the pure life, or brahmacariya), and *Abhisamācārikāsikkhā* (the higher training in proper conduct). These will be the two categories used in these books and I shall proceed to explain Vinaya according to them. The first book will deal with the rules and laws laid down by the Exalted Buddha as His ordinances these being the fundamental principles recited in the presence of the Sangha every fortnight, collectively called the *Pāṭimokkha*. The second book deals with Abhisamācāra laid down or allowed by Lord Buddha as fine behaviour and good tradition, not being included in *Pāṭimokkha*. The detailed arrangement of these two books will be shown upon their respective contents pages.

I should like to make it plain to you that I am satisfied with the *Kālāma Sutta* (*Tika Nipāta, Anguttara Nikāya*) as the word of the Exalted Buddha who spoke it to the people of the Kālāma clan of Kesaputta village in the state of Kosala. In this sutta he taught the Kālāmas ten different ways in which they should not believe since they can be called unreasonable.\* After having considered these ways for themselves, the Kālāmas should not take what is wrong but should take what is shown to be right.

---

\* (see the Mahāmakut publication, "A Criterion of True Religion"—a translation of the *Kālāma Sutta* with explanations. Translators' note).



Among the ten different ways, one should be mentioned here: “*mā piṭakasampadānena* — do not believe according to the texts or scriptures”. My habit is not to believe all the words which are found in the scriptures, but rather believing the reasonable words; moreover, we have learned the history of the sacred books, as outlined above, so that we should not grasp them as our only source. The basis of my writing is that which is found to be reasonable and this should be taken as credible evidence, while what is defective should be opposed whether coming from the Pāli or from the Atthakathā. With this in mind I have given some opinions so that Vinaya-experts may continue these researches and I hope that this will happen for the progress of knowledge. If we believe only in the way of ‘disjunction from-knowledge’ (*nāna-vippayutta*) the increase of knowledge will be impossible.

In writing this book, very often I have resorted to the *Pubbasikkhāvaṇṇanā* (in Thai) because its writer collected the various scriptures according to subject and my purpose is to comment upon *Pubbasikkhāvaṇṇanā* as a *tikā* or subcommentary on that book, filling the defective gaps and correcting the mistakes in order to reach accomplishment. The *Pubbasikkhāvaṇṇanā* is like a device in my hand or it may be said that I have re-arranged the contents of that book in a new order. I am grateful to Phra Amarābhirakkhita (Amara Gert) the abbot of Wat Boromnivāsa who is the writer of that book.

Again, my thanks are offered to Phra Dhammatrilokācārya (Nāṇavara Charoen) abbot of Wat Thepsirindrāvāsa who was my helper, sometimes aiding me in locating sources of given subjects and my thanks are due also to Phra Mahā Upagutto (Aap) of Wat Bovoranives Vihāra who was my saddhivihārika and who helped me to write out the draft manuscript of this book.

I devote the energy put into writing this book to the reverence of the ancient teachers who in succession maintained the Buddhist Teachings, including among them my Upajjhāya and Ācariya who taught me to understand the excellent Dhamma-Vinaya and who were my sources of knowledge in the undertaking of this work.

*Krom-Vajirañāṇavarorasa*

*Wat Bovoranives Vihāra*

Monday, the 6th of October

B.E. 2456 ( 1913 )



“And even, O bhikkhus, as the great ocean is stable and does not overflow its bounds, even so, O bhikkhus, whatever training-rule has been laid down by me for hearkeners (sāvakā), they will not transgress it even for life's sake . . . . .”

**The words of the Exalted Buddha.**

( Vinaya-piṭaka, Pārājika-pāli ).



**The Obverse** of the medallion reproduced on the cover has the head of Somdetch Phra Mahā Samana Chao Krom Phrayā Vajirañāṇavarorasa with the inscription above: MANUSSANĀGO VAJIRANĀṆAVARORASO. MANUSSANĀGO was his personal name later used as his chāyā or ordination name, while VAJIRANĀṆAVARORASO was his title as Royal Prince and as Sangharāja. The medallion was issued in commemoration of his age reaching five cycles, or sixty years.

**The Reverse** of the same medallion drawn above is adorned with a diamond radiating light above (as he was the "excellent son" of VAJIRANĀṆO or King Mongkut) and lotuses below and has the date B.E. 2463 (1920) and the Pāli inscription:

*Abhivādana sīlissa                      niccam vuddhāpacāyino*  
*Cattāro dhammā vadḍhantu āyu vaṇṇo sukham balaṃ*

*May he of respectful nature who  
 ever the elders honouring,  
 Grow surely in four qualities:  
 long-life and beauty, happiness and strength.*



# CONTENTS

	<b>Foreword</b> .....	i
	<b>Somdetch Phra Mahā Samaṇa Chao</b>	
	<b>Krom Phrayā Vajirañāṇavarorasa</b> .....	v
	<b>Preface</b> .....	ix
CHAPTER I	<b>Upasampadā</b> ( <i>Acceptance as a bhikkhu</i> ) .....	1
	The Four Fulfilling Conditions .....	4
CHAPTER II	<b>The Vinaya</b> .....	9
	The Root-cause of Paññatti	
	( <i>regulations</i> ) .....	10
	Āpatti ( <i>offences</i> ) .....	12
	The Benefits of Vinaya .....	18
CHAPTER III	<b>The Rules of Training</b> .....	21
	The Training-rules in the Pāṭimokkha .....	23
CHAPTER IV	<b>Pārājika</b> – Defeat .....	27
	The First Rule of Training .....	27
	The Second Rule of Training .....	30
	The Third Rule of Training .....	45
	The Fourth Rule of Training .....	48
CHAPTER V	<b>Saṅghādisesa</b> – Formal Meeting .....	55
	Nine Established at once upon	
	being Āpatti .....	55
	Four Established on the Third	
	Announcement .....	72
	Summary .....	77
	<b>Aniyata</b> – Indefinite .....	78
CHAPTER VI	<b>Nissaggiya-pācittiya</b> – Expiation with	
	Forfeiture .....	82
	The Section on Cloths, first. ....	82
	The Section on Rugs, second. ....	101
	The Section on Bowls, third. ....	107
	Summary of the Bases for Nissaggiya .....	119
	Practical Treatment for Nissaggiya .....	121

<b>CHAPTER VII</b>	<b>Pācittiya</b> – Expiation	124
	The Section on False Speech, first.	124
	The Section on Plants, second.	134
	The Section on Exhortation, third.	142
	The Section on Food, fourth.	146
	The Section on Naked Ascetics, fifth.	158
	The Section on Drinking Liquor, sixth.	166
	The Section on Living Beings, seventh.	176
	The Section on According with Dhamma, eighth.	182
	The Section on Treasures, ninth.	191
	Summary	199
<b>CHAPTER VIII</b>	<b>Pāṭidesaniya</b> – To be Confessed	202
	<b>Sekhiya</b> – Trainings	204
	First group – On Proper Behaviour	204
	Second group – On Food	210
	Third Group – On Teaching Dhamma	220
	Fourth Group – Miscellaneous	224
<b>CHAPTER IX</b>	<b>Adhikaraṇa-samatha</b> – The Settlement of Legal Processes	226
<b>CHAPTER X</b>	<b>Measurements</b>	231
	Time Measurement	231
	Linear Measurement	235
	Capacity Measurement	236
	Weight Measurement	237
	Standards of Money	238
	Special Measurements (dealing with the Sugata-span, etc.)	240



## CHAPTER I

### UPASAMPADĀ

There have been from ancient times until the present a number of persons who have preferred to instruct the people in the practice of Dhamma. According to their ideas such teaching would not be a waste of their lives, on the contrary it would be of great benefit to the people. Those who hold firmly to their ideals renounce their wealth, honour and individual happiness, and taking up the *brahmacariya* (chaste life) of one ordained, wander here and there in order to teach people, devoting their time for teaching their ideals to others. Having a large gathering of disciples, such people are called Teachers (*sāstā, satthā*) whose teachings, which are believed by many people and which are handed down through generations (from teacher to pupil), are called sects (*laddhi*) or religions (*sāsana*).

Our Teacher is one of those people. Although He was born in the Khattiya (noble warrior) class and became heir to the throne, being one who would receive the royal treasure and continue the royal line, still He was imbued with Great Compassion both innate and constant for all the people who He had the opportunity to benefit as they were under His control, yet He preferred instructing the people to reigning as king. He was not deterred from living a hard and chaste life. This preference was the cause for His renunciation. It was common for those who were ordained with such a purpose to decide either that they would join with others and help them, or that they would seek their own way. At first, Prince Siddhattha resolved to join others and therefore went to live in the two hermitages (of Ālāra Kālāma and Uddaka Rāmaputta) but He was not satisfied with these two



sectarian teachers and later, He decided to seek His own way. Having done so, it was in the nature of things for Him to choose the way and then to decide by which method He should teach. Continuing His search He realized that moral purity is the root cause of all virtues. At first striving with energy and perseverance He attained that purity and then He taught that same way to the people.

To begin with, He taught those who had already gone forth and when they were convinced and asked to join with Him, He allowed them to be bhikkhus by saying, "Ehi bhikkhu, svākkhāto dhammo caro brahmacariyaṃ sammā dukkhassa antakiriya" — "Come bhikkhu, well-expounded is the Dhamma, live the brahmacariya for the complete ending of dukkha".

Having said this, those aspirants were accepted and joined the Sangha. This ordination is called *Ehi-bhikkhu upasampadā* which means the "Acceptance by saying, Come bhikkhu!" At the time when there were many disciples or *sāvaka*s, they were sent (by the Exalted Buddha) to various countries to propagate the Dhamma and when there were, as a consequence of this, many more aspirants for ordination, the *sāvaka*s led them to the presence of the Exalted Buddha so that they might get permission to be bhikkhus according to the tradition established at first by Him. The Exalted Buddha realized the difficulties of both leaders and followers due to the rough and difficult paths. He allowed therefore, his *sāvaka*s themselves to accept the aspirants but He changed the procedure so that it was no longer done by beckoning and gestures on His part but later aspirants had first to shave their heads and beards and then to clad themselves in *kāsāya* robes (of ochre colour) as a mark of their condition. Then they had to utter the solemn words of going for Refuge to the Triple Gem while showing the proper gestures of respect. Having done this, the aspirant was accepted and joined the community as a bhikkhu. Hence, this form of ordination is called *Tisaraṇagamanūpasampadā*, meaning



the "Acceptance by Going for Refuge to the Triple Gem". In those early times, soon after His Enlightenment, the method of receiving a person who wished to become a bhikkhu was accomplished by the individual, that is to say either by the Exalted Buddha, or by one of his sāvakas.

At the end of this period, the Sāsana increased very much, growth among followers comprising both bhikkhus and laity, men and women. With a view to establish a firm foundation for the Buddhasāsana and wishing to benefit the people, the Exalted Buddha allowed the Sangha to be the authority for control of the community. 'Sangha' here, does not mean individual bhikkhus as understood by the common people (in Siam now) but has the meaning of many bhikkhus who assemble to carry out some duty, just as a quorum of some society's members are authorized to take action,—this is called 'sangha'. The numbers of bhikkhus comprising a sangha is determined by their function. Most functions require a sangha of four bhikkhus which is called *caturvagga* (a group of four) but some functions need a sangha of five bhikkhus, some ten bhikkhus, while some require twenty. These are respectively called *pañcavagga*, *dasavagga*, *visativagga* (groups of five, ten, twenty). When we come to this stage, the upasampadā becomes one of the functions performed by a sangha. At that time Lord Buddha ceased to give ordination by himself and instructed his sāvakas also not to ordain (by the Going to the Three-Refuge-Upasampadā). He then allowed the sangha to give the kind of ordination called *ñatti-catutthakamma-upasampadā*, meaning that the bhikkhus assemble according to the number of members required for the function (to be done) in the place called the *sīmā* (a limited area with an established boundary) first announcing the motion regarding the acceptance of an aspirant to join the community and then obtaining the approval of all participating bhikkhus. In a country where there were plenty of bhikkhus, which at that time meant the Middle Country (Gangetic Valley in India), ten bhikkhus were needed to



accomplish the upasampadā. But in a country where bhikkhus were (or are) difficult to find, as in some remote places, only five bhikkhus were required. Upasampadā accomplished by the power of the sangha is the form practised to the present day.

Generally speaking there are three kinds of bhikkhus, namely those who were ordained by Lord Buddha Himself known as Ehibhikkhu-upasampadā, those who were ordained by His sāvakas being called Tisaraṇagamanūpasampadā and those given ordination by a sangha, called Ñatticatutthakamma-upasampadā. These three groups of bhikkhus had a common *saṃvāsa*, that is, they lived by the same code of discipline and were considered equal in all respects.

The method called *Tisaraṇagamanūpasampadā* which was discontinued for bhikkhus, was adopted for the ordination of young persons under twenty years old, which became the prescribed minimum age for a bhikkhu. The youths ordained in this way were called *sāmaṇera* who were given ordination by an individual bhikkhu who was senior, that is a *thera*. So with the coming into existence of the *sāmaṇera* there were two kinds of ordination, that of *upasampadā* to become a bhikkhu, and that of *pabbajjā* for a *sāmaṇera*. However, before a person can be ordained with the upasampadā, he must pass through the Going-forth or pabbajjā, this being the combination which has been practised until the present day.

#### Four Fulfilling Conditions (*Sampatti*)

Now I shall explain the tradition of giving the upasampadā by the sangha, the rules and regulations for which can be summarized as follows:

- 1) The person who wishes for upasampadā must be male.
- 2) He must have reached the prescribed age of 20 years calculated from conception (this is fixed by carefully counting the time spent in the mother's womb as six lunar months).



3) He must not be defective as a man, that is a eunuch (or defective in other ways lacking limbs, organs or being deformed).

4) He must never have committed very serious crimes including capital offences, for example, matricide, patricide, and so on.

5) He must never have committed any serious offence according to Buddhasāsana, such as committing a *pārājika* offence when previously ordained as a bhikkhu. Or, although he had been a bhikkhu in the past yet he had wrong view and entered some other religion.

(These points will now be discussed in greater detail). If one has committed such serious offences or one is woman, then such persons cannot receive upasampadā and their ordination would be known as *vatthu-vipatti*, literally, defect of the material (i.e. the person to be ordained). If a sangha gives the upasampadā knowing or not knowing about such defects, the aspirant will not be a bhikkhu according to the rules (laid down by Lord Buddha). Whenever the sangha come to know of such defects, that person already 'ordained' must be expelled from the sangha. A person who is lacking such defects and who therefore does not run counter to any of the five points above is called *vatthu-sampatti* (perfection of material) and can be given upasampadā by the sangha. A person who although not at all defective in any of the five points above should still be carefully examined by the sangha before giving upasampadā to avoid giving upasampadā to thieves, hooligans and others of bad repute punishable by the civil courts. Also to be avoided are persons having symbols tattooed on their bodies (as punishment in ancient times) according to the crimes committed, or having scars on their backs resulting from flogging (in the royal courts of old), or having deformed limbs or chronic disease such that they cannot carry out the duties of a bhikkhu, or persons with infectious diseases, or those living



under the protection of others such as parents, government officials, also bondsmen and debtors. The latter classes (from protection of parents to the end), when they are released from that custody can receive upasampadā. For instance, sons who are allowed by their parents, government officials granted permission by those in authority, bondsmen freed from their work and debtors who have paid off their debts, are also to be allowed upasampadā. Though these persons are prohibited, yet they are not absolutely prohibited from upasampadā, as are the first group of persons. If the sangha unknowingly gives the upasampadā to this latter group their upasampadā remains valid and they are not to be expelled from the sangha.

When the sangha wants to give upasampadā, the full number of bhikkhus necessary must be convened, this being known as *parisa-sampatti* (perfection of the assembly). If there are less bhikkhus than the required number this is called *parisa-vipatti* (defect of the assembly) and upasampadā will be impossible.

Upasampadā is an activity in which all the bhikkhus together must take part. Within a boundary or *śīmā* in a place where there are more bhikkhus than the prescribed number, but they do not all come to take part in the upasampadā, neither do they give their consent, the sangha which has been assembled although complete as to numbers cannot give upasampadā. This is called *śīmā-vipatti* (defect of the boundary). Therefore, the sangha though complete as to numbers must assemble within a limited area when their upasampadā will be valid, this being known as *śīmā-sampatti* (perfection of the boundary).

Before the actual upasampadā there is a preliminary step which must be taken by the sangha. It must examine the qualifications of the aspirants (and to do so the sangha must agree to one or two *ācariya* or teachers for chanting the examination). The questions which the teacher or teachers ask the aspirants cover only a part of the defects. It is probable that the most serious questions have



been selected (to be asked in the presence of the sangha), or perhaps in the early days there were only these considerations, the others (defects of a lesser nature) being added later. The aspirant requires one bhikkhu who will recommend him and bring him into the presence of the assembled sangha and this bhikkhu is called the *upajjhāya*. The *upajjhāya* must be an able and senior bhikkhu who can teach the new bhikkhu when he has been ordained, and must also examine the necessary requisites or *parikkhāra*, for example, the robes and bowl belonging to the aspirant. If they are not complete, it is the duty of the *upajjhāya* to provide them. The sangha must authorize one bhikkhu to question the aspirant regarding these requisites. This *upasampadā* must be given only to a person agreeing to it and must not be forced upon an unwilling person. It is a tradition that the applicant must first utter the words requesting the Going-forth. All these things to be done are called Preliminary functions and should be completed before the motion and announcements. If these preliminary functions are lacking in any way, provided that they do not concern serious defects, the *upasampadā* is still valid but still it will not be in accordance with the tradition.

When all the above perfections (*sampatti*) are complete, the time has arrived for announcing the acceptance of that aspirant into the community. It is the duty of one bhikkhu who is able and knowledgeable to make the announcement in the presence of the sangha. The announcement is made altogether four times, the first being the motion (*ñatti*) informing the sangha and asking for the acceptance of that aspirant. The following three announcements are called the *anusāvanā*, the words of consultation of the sangha to each other, during the recital of which any member of the sangha has the chance to speak. If any bhikkhu at this time should oppose the motion and announcements then that function will be spoilt but if all remain silent, their approval is understood. After that, the announcement of the sangha's approval is made and the teacher (or teachers if both *ācariyas* are chanting) says that he will remember (this consent). In the announcement

the name of the aspirant, that of the upajjhāya who is bringing the applicant to the sangha as well as mention of the sangha must be uttered and must not be omitted, this being done fully, strictly and not the reverse. This is called *Kammavācā-sampatti* (the perfection of announcing the Act). As against this there is *Kammavācā-vipatti* which cannot be used (due to those defects in announcing the Act). The sangha who will give the upasampadā must be in accordance with these five sampatti and thereby the upasampadā will be carried out properly according to the rules laid down by the Exalted Buddha.

### Summary of the Four Fulfilling Conditions

1. Vatthu-sampatti—of the material (i.e. personal qualities)
2. Parisa-sampatti—of the assembly
3. Sīmā-sampatti—of the boundary
4. Kammavācā-sampatti—of announcing the Act

The last may sometimes be divided into two thus making up a list of Five Sampatti:

4. Ānatti-sampatti—of the motion
5. Anusāvanā-sampatti—of the announcements



## CHAPTER II

### THE VINAYA

Due to the small number of bhikkhus at the beginning (of the Sāsana) rules and regulations for the control of the Sangha were not much needed. All the *sāvakas* practised and followed the Teacher's way of conduct, knowing full well the teaching of the Exalted Buddha. When bhikkhus increased in numbers and were scattered here and there, then the rules for their control became more necessary.

Men living in society cannot live as individuals without connection to others because men have different dispositions and strengths, the rough and the strong bullying the others so that the polite but weak people have no happiness, hence (living like this) society will be disordered. Therefore the king must establish laws preventing people from doing evil and punishing the guilty. Besides this, individual groups have established traditions and rules for themselves, as for instance the polite behaviour followed in a well-bred family. There must also be rules and regulations in the bhikkhu-community in order to prevent wrong behaviour and instigate bhikkhus to behave properly. The Master has been established both in the position of the King of Dhamma whose duty is to govern, and as the Father of Sangha who takes care of the bhikkhusangha. He has carried out both these two duties, that is, as King of Dhamma he has established the rules and laws called *Buddhapāṇṇatti* to prevent wrong behaviour and warn bhikkhus who would commit such and such offences of the penalties, and that in some cases these would be heavy and in some they would be light, just as the King issues decrees and laws. Secondly, the Master as Father of the Sangha has set up the traditions of good conduct which are called *Abhisamācāra* urging



bhikkhus to behave properly, just as the revered father of a family who has trained his children to follow the traditions of their family.

Both Buddhapaññatti and Abhisamācāra are called *Vinaya* and this *Vinaya* is compared to the thread through a garland connecting together the flowers; in the same way *Vinaya* helps to establish firmly the bhikkhusangha. Again, those who have been ordained come from high, middle and some from low-class families and are different in character and different in taste. If there was not a *Vinaya* to control them, or if they did not follow the *Vinaya*, they would be a bad community of bhikkhus and such would not be conducive to the arising of *saddhā* and *pasāda* (wise faith and serene clarity—in other people). If they follow the *Vinaya* however, they would be a good community which is conducive to the arising in others of *saddhā* and *pasāda*, just as with different kinds of flowers piled upon a tray, though some are fragrant and beautiful in form, they become unattractive because mixed together. But if those flowers are threaded together by a skilled worker, they become beautiful and even the plain flowers look nice, what to speak of the beautiful and fragrant blossoms. The *Vinaya* rules do indeed make bhikkhus beautiful.

### The Root-cruse of Paññatti

The *Vinaya* was not laid down before (some event necessitating a ruling) but came into existence according to causes known as *nidāna* and *pakarāṇa* (both meaning origin-story). Whenever blameworthy conduct occurred through the wrongdoing of some bhikkhu, then the Exalted Buddha laid down the rule of training accordingly. For example, the proclamation issued by King Bimbisāra, who following royal tradition, on the day of his coronation said: 'Grass, wood and water are given to samanas and brahmins by me'. This led Phra Dhaniya to understand that he might take royal timber to build his kuṭī, quoting this statement (as his authority to receive) a royal gift. When this had occurred, the Exalted Buddha laid down the training-rule on 'taking what is



not given'. Even abhisamācāra have been laid down by this same method. When the rule of training has been established but somehow is unsuitable, that is, loosely formulated and thus unable to prevent the wrongdoing, the Exalted Buddha has further laid down a stricter rule. For example, first He laid down the rule against the destruction of human beings' lives but that rule did not cover prevention of those who would speak in praise of death or those who persuaded others to suicide. Therefore, He had to supplement the above rule with additions.

On other occasions, He laid down first a strict rule which later, (seeing the need for) leniency, He relaxed. For example, the Exalted Buddha laid down the rule upon one who speaks about states of superhuman attainment as though these are won by him but which he has not experienced. This rule of training at first included in its scope those who understood that they had won to superhuman attainments but later the Exalted Buddha added the clause 'unless it was through over-estimation'. He did not withdraw rules of training which were already laid down being found to be unsuitable but supplemented them with *anupaññatti* (after-regulations), changing the original purpose so that perhaps it spoilt the original aim. For example, He laid down the rule of training that bhikkhus should not sleep in the same place as those without upasampadā with the purpose that householders should not see the odd behaviour of bhikkhus while sleeping. Later, when sāmaṇeras came into existence they were included among those without upasampadā. Since sāmaṇeras had no *kuṭī* (lodging) to live in, the Exalted Buddha relaxed the rule so that bhikkhus could sleep in the same place as non-upasampadā persons, but only for three nights. As a result bhikkhus can sleep in the same place as householders, and so on. The rule first laid down by Lord Buddha is called the *mūla-paññatti* (the root-regulation) while the supplement added later by Him is the *anupaññatti* (the auxillary regulation). Both of these together are known as *sikkhāpada*, the rule of training. Some training-rules have many *anupaññatti*, for example, that one governing 'eating in a group'



meaning accepting invitations to eat in a group (*gaṇa*) in which the names of the dishes to be served are mentioned. But leniency upon some occasions was allowed by the Exalted Buddha as in the times of sickness, when giving new robes, when making robes, when going on a journey, when embarking on a boat, in time of scarcity, when at the invitation of *samaṇas*. When the original cause occurred upon which was laid down the rule of training, the Exalted Buddha convened a meeting of the *bhikkhus* and asked the original wrong-doer to tell the truth and then pointed out the disadvantage of wrong behaviour and the advantages of restraint and laid down the training-rule preventing *bhikkhus* from further wrong-doing, adding for those who infringed the rule, light or heavy penalties accordingly.

### Āpatti (offences)

The action of transgressing the rules of training and the falling of the penalty (upon the guilty *bhikkhu*) is called *āpatti*, which means 'reaching, attaining, committing'. The *āpatti* consist of three grades of penalties; the heavy offence (*garukāpatti*) which causes one committing it to fall from the state of *bhikkhuhood*; the middle (*majjhimāpatti*) causing the offender to live on probation, that is to practise in a certain way making it difficult for oneself; and the light offence (*lahukāpatti*) which causes the offender to confess in front of a *bhikkhu* (or *bhikkhus*) so that having carried out the prescribed discipline, he will be free from the offence. In another way of reckoning there are two grades of *āpatti*: *atekicchā* which are incurable offences, that is the heavy *āpatti* (as *pārājika* - defeat), and *satekicchā*, or curable offences covering the middle and light *āpatti*. Again, according to categories, there are seven *āpattis*, viz, *pārājika* (heavy); *saṅghādisesa* (middle); *thullaccaya*, *pācittiya*, *pāṭidesanīya*, *dukkata*, and *dubbhāsita* (five grades of light offences).

Āpatti is not committed in the mind, that is, only thinking that 'I shall do this and that' is not called breaking the training-rules and is not known as trying to break the training-rules. Āpatti is



committed through the body or by speech or sometimes it is together with mind, that is, when one does or speaks with intention, *sacittaka*; but sometimes without mind, that is, when one does or speaks without intention, *acittaka*. For instance, an āpatti may be committed *through the body* as when a bhikkhu drinks intoxicants, even though he does not know it is an intoxicant yet he still breaks the rule. An āpatti is committed *by speech*, for example the pācittiya involved in teaching Dhamma by reciting together with one not having upasampadā and though a bhikkhu is careful not to recite together with such a person still he commits an āpatti, whether it is by accident or not. Āpatti can be committed *both by body and mind* as when a bhikkhu commits a pārājika having stolen by himself. Apatti is committed *by speech and mind* in the case of a bhikkhu who in speaking, orders another to steal. Accordingly, the direct root-causes for the arising of āpatti consist of four means: *body alone, speech alone, body and mind, speech and mind*. But in Pāli there are another two means: body and speech together, body, speech and mind together. So altogether there are six root-causes for the arising of āpatti. The explanation regarding the above Pāli is that body and speech are the root-cause of āpatti which is brought about either by body or by speech but a proper example is not found. Thus I shall not give an example in this book. Body, speech and mind together are the root-cause of āpatti which is brought about either by body and mind or speech and mind for example: a bhikkhu commits pārājika because he stole as mentioned above. The example of āpatti which has arisen through body and mind will be seen in the pārājika offence of committing sexual intercourse, while the āpatti arising through speech and mind may be illustrated by the dukkaṭa āpatti of teaching Dhamma to one who is not respectful and not ill. Therefore, in the *Atthakathā* the commentator classified the origin of āpatti into thirteen categories by counting the āpattis which have arisen through one and through many originations but I am sure that this is superfluous and unclear and so it will not be given here. Those who want to consult the detail of this may look in the book "*Pubbasiikkhāvāṇṇanā*" of Phra Amarābhīrakkhita (Amara Gert).



By intention, āpatti can be divided into two groups, one arising through the origination with intention-*sacittaka*, while the other has origin without intention and is called *acittaka*. These two important categories should be remembered (by readers) for knowing types of āpatti. Regarding the last, it is rather severe to inflict a penalty upon one who commits an āpatti without intention but the civil law here provides a comparison. The court does punish persons who do wrong without intention because what is already done is also wrong-doing. The way to determine whether āpatti is *sacittaka* or *acittaka* will be seen in the meaning and word-sequence of individual training-rules, for example, in the section *Musāvādavagga*, (the first) of Pācittiya, the third training-rule deals with slander spoken intentionally by a bhikkhu and so is an example of *sacittaka*. In the training-rule on drinking wines and spirits (Pācittiya 51) it is pointed out that there is no mention of intention so āpatti is *acittaka*. The terms 'purposely' *sañcicca*, or 'knowingly' *jānam*, are found in some training-rules and when these are broken this transgression must be classed as *sacittaka*. An example of this is seen in the 77th Pācittiya on the subject of "provoking worry in a bhikkhu *purposely* (*sañcicca*) thinking: Thus he will be uncomfortable even for a while." One other training-rule (Pācittiya 66) upon setting out on a journey *knowingly* (*jānam*) and by appointment with a caravan of thieves, may be taken as another example of *sacittaka*. In whichever training-rules these terms do not occur and the statement is not precise, the āpatti consequent upon breaking that training-rule is *acittaka*. We may see an example in the training-rule Pācittiya 67, 'arranging to go on the same journey with a woman even to go through one village' (which as there is no mention of *sañcicca* or *jānam*) is *acittaka*. The conclusion accordingly is as follows: if there has been omission in the words of the training-rule from early times, or the reciting bhikkhu remembered wrongly (in days before books), my conclusion might perhaps be wrong. This is the cause for the difficult determination of āpatti, whether they are *sacittaka* or *acittaka*.



Among society in general there are not only the *wrong-doings of commission* but also *those of omission*, as when a man is called up to serve in the army but he does not comply, so in the same way there are āpatti of omission. This is seen in Pācittiya 84 where a bhikkhu has seen that valuables (belonging to a layman) have been left behind in his *kuṭī*, *sālā*, etc., but he does not keep them for the owner. The commentator keeping in mind this explanation gave full comments upon this but his remarks are superfluous. Those who wish to know should look in the *Pubbasiṅgāvaṇṇanā*.

Again, there is āpatti known as *lokavajja* (worldly faults), that is to say, the common people who are not bhikkhus can also commit such wrongs and the penalties will be borne by them also as when there is a case of stealing, killing human beings and even the lighter wrong-doings of striking, scolding, abusing and so forth. There are other āpatti which if common people do like actions, then they will not be guilty and cannot be punished since the āpatti are peculiar to bhikkhus who have broken the Exalted Buddha's disciplinary code. Examples of this are seen in digging soil, eating at the 'wrong time' and so on. There will be no fault on the part of householders who do such things so that these special bhikkhu rules are called *paññattivajja* (formulated faults). This explanation is my own understanding but in the Atthakathā on the Vinaya, the commentator said that āpatti which are *lokavajja* are those which are committed at the time when the wrong-doer has an unskillful state of mind (*akusalacitta*). An example of this may be seen in bhikkhus drinking wines and spirits with the knowledge that they are intoxicating. Āpatti which are *paññattivajja* are (in the Atthakathā) those committed when a bhikkhu has skilled states of mind (*kusalacitta*) but the commentator did not give an example. However a case of this may be seen when a bhikkhu plucks flowers (Pācittiya 11) with intent to revere the Triple Gem. These two explanations really harmonize in the following way: in the case of *lokavajja* those bad improper actions whether done by bhikkhus or by lay people



(always arise from unskillful states of mind) but in the case of *paññattivajja*, faults committed by bhikkhus having their origin in skillful states of mind are not regarded by non-bhikkhus as being faults at all. Regarding these two vajja, the commentator does not explain them clearly so I should like to recommend the following statement to fellow dhamma-practicers: The āpatti called *lokavajja* committed by bhikkhus will bring about a great loss (of honour to the sangha) and though the bhikkhu has confessed his offence already, that loss will leave a scar which will not heal over easily. Bhikkhus should therefore be careful in these matters. Among the *paññattivajja*, there are offences which bhikkhus abstain from strictly and if transgressed will also prove a loss, but there are others in this group which bhikkhus are not so much concerned with because of changes both in time and country and if such offences are committed then they will not prove a great loss. Bhikkhus should not be taken up with this latter kind of āpatti, making it the standard for their strict practice. I have heard that pious laypeople invited a bhikkhu to give a *desanā* (sermon) from a Dhamma-seat upon which there was a sitting-mat filled with kapok. That bhikkhu did not sit down there but asked the laypeople to remove that mat. According to my view, acting in this way is not polite and not better than sitting upon the mat for a certain time. If bhikkhus want to observe strictly (such training-rules as these), then they should do so only within the bounds of the wat. So that bhikkhus are polite not creating a disturbance, the Exalted Buddha often allowed bhikkhus permission (to relax some rule). Those who are not strict, seeing that there are many āpatti which cannot be avoided, become heedless and do not know how to select (rules to be kept strictly) or how to avoid (āpatti which bring loss). Behaving in this way they are very careless though they should know how to behave in a fitting manner. Those who behave in a manner fitting to the *Sāsanadhamma* which is the practice of the Middle Way, do not fall into the lax extreme of sensual indulgence (*kāma sukhallikānuyoga*), nor do they fall into the severe extreme of self-mortification (*attakilamathānuyoga*).



The conditions for the commission of āpatti are six in number: (1) *alajjhita* – done shamelessly; (2) *añāṇatā* – done unknowingly; (3) *kukkucca-pakatatā* – done with doubt but done all the same; (4) *akappiyekappiyasaññitā* – done thinking that something is allowable though it is not allowable; (5) *kappiye-akappiyasaññitā* – done thinking something is not allowable though it is allowable; (6) *sati-sammosā* – done with confused mindfulness. Bhikkhus who break the rules knowingly, do so with a mind stubborn and shameless, so this is called ‘*doing with shamelessness*’. Bhikkhus who do not know that there are rules laid down by the Exalted Buddha and who break those rules, do so ‘*unknowingly*’. Bhikkhus who doubt whether in doing such and such a thing they will break a rule but nevertheless continue (with that action) carelessly, if in fact their actions are against some rules, then the penalty for them will be in accordance with the base but if there is no offence, a *dukkata* (wrong-doing) must arise due to ‘*doing with doubt but doing all the same*’. Bhikkhus are forbidden flesh which should not be used as food but a bhikkhu may eat (one of the 10 forbidden kinds) thinking that it is allowable, which would be an example of ‘*having done thinking that something is allowable though it is not allowable*’. Bhikkhus are allowed flesh which is used as food and a bhikkhu may think that it is one of the sorts of forbidden flesh but eat it nevertheless, a case of ‘*thinking something not allowable though it is allowable*’. Honey is included as medicine and it can be kept by a bhikkhu for seven days but he might forget and keep it longer than that, which would be ‘*done with confused mindfulness*’.

Suppose that the following question arises here: Should the penalty for āpatti also fall upon bhikkhus who break rules unknowingly, failing to understand or doing with confused mindfulness, just as it falls upon those who do so shamelessly and though in doubt nevertheless carry out their intention, or should there be leniency? Though there seems to be some justice in this question, first you should call to mind the civil law and whether there is



exception made for those who do not know that law. If such exception was made there would be few people who paid attention to the law. If there was exception for those who misunderstood and forgot the law, then there would be an excuse for wrong-doers. It is the same with the Vinaya: when there is no exception made, newly-ordained bhikkhus must pay attention and learn the Exalted Buddha's law. They must carefully observe the practice and have knowledge and mindfulness. This will be then the cause for their progress in the Exalted Buddha's Teaching, being also the instrument for stopping shameless bhikkhus who seek for a chance to excuse themselves. The Exalted Buddha did not make exceptions where no exception should be made but He did make an exception where it should be made, for example, a newly-ordained bhikkhu does not know how to wear his robes properly and the penalty does not fall upon him who does not know (how to wear them) if he has the intention to study the Vinaya. The penalty falls upon those who know how to wear the robes properly but pay little attention to this. It is the duty of bhikkhus who commit āpatti arising from the six conditions to confess according to the kind of āpatti, as said above. If a bhikkhu conceals his āpatti and pays little attention to them, it is the duty of other bhikkhus who have learnt (of those āpatti of their friend) to warn the offender out of friendliness (mettā) towards him. If he is still obstinate, it is the duty of the bhikkhus to reprove him and to exclude him from hearing Pātimokkha. For the sake of progress of the Sāsana, the sangha should take action according to the Dhamma-Vinaya. Therefore, bhikkhus should behave honestly and in accordance with the trust placed in them by the Exalted Buddha. Those actions which do destroy His trust are bad and are not proper to the samāna.

### **The Benefits of Vinaya**

Vinaya which is correctly observed by the bhikkhu will yield benefits, that is, not to suffer remorse in mind (*vippaṭisāra*). Bhikkhus who behave loosely will suffer this remorse and some-



times even will be caught, punished and therefore be blamed by others. When (a remorseful bhikkhu) enters an assembly of well-disciplined bhikkhus, he is afraid of being reproved by them. Even though no one reproves him, the mental disturbance (of having done evil) lingers in his mind. Finally, when he thinks of himself, he will blame himself and joy and happiness will not arise in him. Those bhikkhus who like to follow strictly but who lack a good understanding of Vinaya prefer to follow it blindly according the text, copying the bhikkhu-practice of the Buddha-time. But they have been born in a different time and country and so they will surely find difficulties in their practice of Vinaya, while their behaviour blindly clings to the tradition which was the ancient way of bhikkhu-practice and which moreover does not refer to the truly important points. By practising thus, Vinaya does not yield benefits, instead yielding only troubles. Those who practise Vinaya without mindfulness and knowledge, are proud of their practice thinking that they are stricter than the others – and blame other bhikkhus saying that they are much worse (in Vinaya) than themselves. This is a blamable action when they have to live together and associate with other bhikkhus who may become disgusted with them and consequently (such wrong practising) bhikkhus bring troubles on themselves. Bhikkhus who behave correctly, on the other hand, will be joyful and happy because they feel that they are behaving properly. Neither will they be caught and punished by others while they gain only praise, and when they have to enter an assembly of disciplined bhikkhus they are bold and not afraid.

Those who want to practise Vinaya to gain success should carefully examine the purposes of Vinaya. Some training-rules and some groups of abhisamācāra were laid down by the Exalted Buddha *to prevent bhikkhus for committing acts of violence* such as 'stealing', or 'killing human beings', such being heavily punished by the civil law. (While some were laid down) *in order to stop bhikkhus from earning their livelihood through*



*deceitful acts*, such as through suggestions of superhuman attainments worthy of the Noble One's knowledge and vision. Also, they *prevent bhikkhus from actions* of 'striking' and 'scolding' and further *stop bad behaviour* of 'lying', 'slander', 'idle chatter' and 'drinking', *prevent impoliteness* as with 'eavesdropping', or *discourage childishness* as 'poking with the fingers', 'playing in the water', or hiding another bhikkhu's requisites'. Sometimes the Exalted Buddha laid down *rules based upon the traditional beliefs of people at that time*, as when He declared as āpattis, digging the soil, or cutting down trees which were thought to possess life (soul). At other times He has laid down *rules to be traditions of bhikkhus in accordance with convenience or the traditions of recluses*. For example, He prohibited bhikkhus from taking a meal at the wrong-time (*vikāla*). Another example is that all eatables and drinkables (except water) for the use of bhikkhus must first be formally offered. These are examples pointing out the main purposes of the training-rules laid down by the Exalted Buddha. Moreover, we should be aware of the rules which have been laid down by Him but which proved unsuitable so that He added supplementary clauses later, either leading to the fulfillment of the original purpose or else to a complete change of purpose, though bhikkhus continue to observe these rules as a formal tradition. Again, bhikkhus should recognize the rules dealing with circumstances of specific time and country, for when a long time has elapsed or the country changed those bhikkhus then find difficulty in practising, and no one can alter them. Then the bhikkhus of that changed time and country seek for the way to avoid them or to give them up. By considering the truths outlined above, a bhikkhu should so practise that he gains success in the purpose of Vinaya, that is to say, he is joyful because he behaves properly and will have no remorse because of careless or incorrect behaviour, and he will not be proud and arrogant, or blame others. Bhikkhus should have friendliness and sympathy in giving advice to fellow Dhamma-practicers who still behave wrongly and carelessly, until they too behave properly.



## CHAPTER III

### THE RULES OF TRAINING

One law laid down by the Exalted Buddha represents one rule of training. Those training-rules which have been laid down as the Exalted Buddha's code comprise the *āḍibrahmacariyā-sikkhā* (the principal training in the pure life) and those which have been laid down as *abhisamācāra* or bhikkhu tradition, represent *abhisamācāra-sikkhā* (the higher training in proper conduct). The former is included in the Pāṭimokkha which the Exalted Buddha allowed for recitation in the assembled sangha every lunar fortnight; while the latter fall outside Pāṭimokkha, except *sekhiyavatta* (75 Trainings) coming in the Pāṭimokkha. This matter is very important and readers should pay attention to it. In this work I shall keep to this classification as the framework of the book and I shall explain accordingly.

The training-rules included within the Pāṭimokkha are a fixed number, while those outside Pāṭimokkha are so many as to be uncountable so that students do not attend to them. Beside these there are more *āpattis* which have been added by the *Ācariyas* composing commentarial books and these are called *Pālimuttaka-dukkatā* (the wrong-doings outside the Pāli). These training-rules seem to be beyond counting so that the bhikkhu cannot attend fully to all of them. Time and country also become obstacles (when they change) and consequently many bhikkhus avoid them, give them up and thus knowingly bear the burden of *āpatti*. But if one *āpatti* could be abolished it would lead to the abolishing of others even though the proper time had not come (for abolishing the latter). The Master realizing this



matter gave His permission at the time of His Parinibbāna so that if the Sangha decided to do so, they could abolish some lesser and minor training-rules. But no one was able to abolish them overtly because they were afraid of disagreement. Moreover, the Dhamma-arranging Ācariyas forbade their abolishment at the time of the *First Sangāyana*. Nevertheless, bhikkhus have (in effect) abolished what they understood to be the minor training-rules but they have done this covertly, that is to say, they do not intend to keep them and consequently they have to bear the burden of āpatti. I have tried to see the proper method to arrange Vinaya, desiring to get rid of discrepancy in the training rules for the sake of development in bhikkhu-education and better practice. I have found that the disciplinary training-rules are divided into two groups: *ādibrahmacariyakā-sikkhā* (the principal training the pure life) and *abhisamācārikā-sikkhā* (the higher training in proper conduct) and comparing the latter with the former, I found at last that they agree, so I decided to explain Vinaya according to these two groups calling the training-rules falling within Pāṭimokkha the *Buddha-āṇā* (the Buddha's Law) which should be practised strictly, and the rest-the higher training in proper conduct (*abhisamācārikā-sikkhā*), are tradition to be practised according to the bhikkhu's ability. Though bhikkhus may be defective in some of the latter still they will not lose their strictness and cannot be accounted shameless. Even bhikkhus who are understood to be Noble Persons still commit āpatti. This can be seen in one Sutta, the essence of which being: "Bhikkhus, one hundred and fifty training-rules come up it for recitation every fortnight and these young men who have gone forth are studying as they desire benefit. Bhikkhus, these training-rules are all included under three headings. What are they? The supreme training in moral conduct, the supreme training in collectedness and the supreme training in wisdom. These are the three in which all the training-rules are included.



Bhikkhus, in this Dhamma-Vinaya, one practises fully in moral conduct (*sīla*), practises to some extent in collectedness (*samādhi*) and practises to some extent in wisdom (*paññā* – thus one may become *sotāpanna* and *sakidāgāmi*). Or one practises fully in both *sīla* and *samādhi* and to some extent in *paññā* (thus one may become *anāgāmi*). Or, one practises fully in *sīla*, *samādhi* and *paññā* (meaning that one is *arahanta*). Then they commit some small āpatti and having confessed it, are purified. How is this possible? Bhikkhus, no one can dispute their ability to attain the *lokuttara-dhamma* just because they have committed such āpatti but they observe the precepts constantly and firmly in those (one hundred and fifty) training-rules which are the basis of brahmacariya and suitable for brahmacariya and they undertake and study them. Bhikkhus, those bhikkhus who can undertake them well in part, should observe them partly, while those who can do so fully, should undertake them fully. By doing so, bhikkhus, I say those training-rules are not barren.” This sutta comes in the 4th chapter of Dutiyapaṇṇāsaka, Book of the Threes, Anguttara Nikāya (p. 301 of the Royal Thai Edition). Those who want to consult it should turn to that page. According to this sutta, the training-rules coming in the Pāṭimokkha are classified as the important division being the basis of brahmacariya, while the rest are arranged as the small training-rules. Here in my book, I include all the training-rules coming in Pāṭimokkha as important, this being more comprehensive than the arrangement in the above sutta.

### **The Training-rules in the Pāṭimokkha**

The sutta which has been translated above shows that the training-rules in the Pāṭimokkha consist of only 150 while the full number is composed of: 4 *Pārājika*, 13 *Saṅghādisesa*,



30 *Nissaggiya Pācittiya*, 92 *Suddhika Pācittiya*, 4 *Pāṭidesanīya*, 7 *Adhikaraṇa-samatha*. The Pāṭimokkha which is recited at present and exists in the Vibhaṅga of the training-rules shows that there are altogether 227 training-rules, made up by adding 2 *Aniyata* 75 and *Sekhiyavatta*. Keeping this in mind, I have decided that in and former times there were just 150 as mentioned in the Sutta before one of the Sangāyanas when the meanings of the sikkhāpada were laid down (called the *Padabhājanīya*, or wordcommentary), at which time it was included as part of the Vibhaṅga or perhaps then the 2 *Aniyata* and the 75 *Sekhiya* were added. The above is probably true, for the *Aniyata* do not lay down a specific penalty as do the other training-rules but they are training-rules which are attached, as though dependent. They may have come into existence because a bhikkhu was accused of being together with a woman, one with the other, in a secluded place but it could not be decided definitely whether he was sitting, standing, or what he was doing. Regarding the *Sekhiyavatta*, they existed already in another place, namely the Vattakkhandhaka in the Cullavagga, moreover they are not important rules for they are *abhisamācāra* and do not mention specific āpatti. Here I shall explain the training-rules in the Pāṭimokkha according to the method of Vinaya.

The training-rules coming in the Pāṭimokkha lay down āpatti of each rule for the bhikkhu who breaks them, directly in the case of *Pārājika*, *Saṅghādisesa*, *Pācittiya* consisting of *Nissaggiya* and *Suddhika*, and *Pāṭidesanīya*; but indirectly in the case of *Thullaccaya*, *Dukkaṭa* and *Dubbhāsita*.

There are training-rules which have been laid down dealing with āpatti more serious than *dukkata*. Suppose a bhikkhu tried to break a rule but he did not commit an āpatti as prescribed in the training-rule. For example, suppose that he tried to kill a



human-being and actually dealt the blow but his victim did not die, in this case the penalty of *pārājika* should not fall upon him but if he receives no punishment that would not be right either. Therefore, a lighter penalty should fall upon him, just as in the case of the civil law which imposes capital punishment for the most serious offenders but if a criminal does not fully break the law he will receive a lighter punishment. This can be clearly seen in the punishment for killing human beings. Āpatti which are less than *pārājika* and *saṅghādisesa* because of incomplete commission are called *thullaccaya* and *dukkata*. Āpatti which are less serious than *pācittiya* except in the case of "*Omāsavāda*" (abusive speech) and less than *pāṭidesanīya* are known only as *dukkata*. Āpatti which are less than the *Omāsavāda* training-rule are called *dubbhāsita*. In each *Sekhiyavatta* there is the term '*sikkhā karaṇīyā*' – (this is a training to be followed) which according to Vibhaṅga means that if he is careless then *dukkata* will fall upon him. These kind of āpatti are distinguished by adding the term '*Vibhaṅga*', namely *Vibhaṅga thullaccaya* and *Vibhaṅga dukkata* in order to distinguish them from āpatti arising from other sources, while *dubbhāsita* does not have the addition of the term '*Vibhaṅga*' because it is found only in one place, that is, in the Vibhaṅga. The original training-rules which are the basis (of these others) are called *mātikā*.

Here in this book I shall discuss the meaning of each of the *sikkhāpada* and also mention in the appropriate place the āpatti in the Vibhaṅga. It was my wish to explain the training-rules by arranging them in groups according to their aims, in order that the student would realize clearly the heavy and the lesser penalties but to depart from the series of training-rules in Pāṭimokkha would create difficulties in remembering and learning. Therefore, I shall explain according to the series found in Pāṭimokkha and then arrange in groups later.



The training-rules within Pāṭimokkha are arranged in groups according to the kind of āpatti, for example, the group of *pārājika*, then *saṅghādisesa*, etc., and each group is called an *uddesa* (section of recitation) *pārājikuddesa*, *saṅghādisesuddesa*, etc., while in the case of the *sekhiyavatta*, it is known as *sekhiyuddesa*. These *uddesas* are preceded by the *Nidānuddesa* in which it is told how bhikkhus who listen to the Pāṭimokkha should behave. Altogether, there are nine of these *uddesas*. Those who do not understand Magadha-language but who wish to know the meaning of these *uddesas* should see the translation of Pāṭimokkha.\* Here in this book, I shall quote the training-rules and translate them exactly according to the original Pāli, so that the student will be able to discern the meaning of the words and the idiom and I shall elucidate in them the points which should be known.

---

\* See "Pāṭimokkha", Pāli text with English translation, published by Mahānakut Rājavidyalaya, Bangkok, B.E. 2512.



## CHAPTER IV

### PĀRĀJIKA

This term is an adjective qualifying 'āpatti' and it means 'making the doer defeated'. It is also an adjective qualifying persons, then meaning 'the defeated one' and it is an adjective qualifying sikkhāpada (training-rule) having the sense of 'pārājika-āpatti falls upon him'. Here in this book it is the name of four training-rules.

#### 1. The first sikkhāpada states:

Should any bhikkhu having undertaken the bhikkhu's training-rules and way of life and having (still) neither disclaimed the training-rule not declared his inability (to keep it), engage in sexual intercourse even with a female animal, he is defeated and no more in communion.

The term 'bhikkhu' here should refer to three groups of bhikkhus (see above, ch. I) but in the Vibhaṅga it is said that it refers to bhikkhus who are given the upasampadā by the sangha through the method of *ñatticatutthakamma-vācā*. This points to the fact that the Vibhaṅga was written down later when bhikkhus were given upasampadā by this means and that is why it is explained in that way. A bhikkhu (such as mentioned in the above sikkhāpada) who is weary of practising the brahmacariya, is able to disclaim the training-rules and able to return to the state of *anupasampanna* (a layperson) but if he does not disclaim the training-rules still holding to the state of a bhikkhu and he engages in sexual intercourse, that is, the action of coupling



while being a bhikkhu, then a *pārājika āpatti* will fall upon him and he is defeated being no more in *saṃvāsa* (communion), being the tradition in which bhikkhus live together with other bhikkhus. That is to say, he is deprived of the privilege of enjoying the benefits gained while being a bhikkhu, for he lacks the training-rules making him the equal of other bhikkhus. Such a bhikkhu has placed himself outside the power of Sangha government being unable again to take part with the sangha in *uposatha*, *pavāraṇā* and *saṅghakamma*.

Regarding the term 'tiracchānagatāyapi' (even with a female animal), it should be understood that in the training-rule above, the ordinary sexual intercourse common to all human beings, the man with the woman is meant, but in the Vibhanga it says, the action of having sexual intercourse by way of the female genital organ, or by the anus, by way of the mouth, in human beings who are female, male or sex-aberrants, in beings which are classed as non-human such as *yakkha*, or *peta* (demons or ghosts) or others which are included here, and in beings which are animals irrespective of their being male, female or hermaphrodite. The action of intercourse undertaken with these beings is called '*methunadhamma*'. A bhikkhu engaging in sexual intercourse by way of the above-mentioned organs, though he does not finish that action, if his penis enters the orifice a little way even to the extent of a sesamum-seed and even if his or the other's sexual organ has been covered (in some way, with cloth, etc.) wound about it, spread over it, or is without such covering, and if the non-humans or animals whom the bhikkhu takes for sexual intercourse, whether living or dead, whether their corpses are fully formed or deficient in some way, yet if they are still the instrument for accomplishment of sexual intercourse, then there will be the *āpatti* of *pārājika*. If a bhikkhu is sexually assaulted but he is pleased at the time when his penis is entering, has fully entered,



remains there or when withdrawing it, then at any of these moments a *pārājika* will fall upon him. Where a bhikkhu allowed another bhikkhu to engage with him in intercourse by way of the anus, or he was assaulted by another bhikkhu and became pleased, or someone while a bhikkhu slept assaulted him so that when he awoke he was pleased, then in all these cases he will be *pārājika*.\* In the Vinītavatthu of this training-rule, it is said that a bhikkhu who had a supple back, with desire to place the penis in his own mouth, bent his back; and that a bhikkhu who had such a long penis that it could be inserted into his own anus, did so, and that in both cases they were *pārājika*. These cases mentioned here seem unlikely to have happened but it might be that a bhikkhu had ordered another to try to make (intercourse) with himself, in which case he would also be *pārājika*.

The cases involving *thullaccaya* and *dukkata* in this training-rule were not laid down clearly so that those who have explained it have themselves not grasped the essential point. Here I shall explain briefly after consideration according to my own understanding but perhaps it will be different from the considerations of other Ācariyas. The (three) orifices which are the basis of (first) *pārājika* and which belong to human beings and animals which have died, if there should be a great deficiency in those orifices and (that bhikkhu) does not fulfill his desire, then the penis (having been placed thus), these are the bases of *thullaccaya*. In the case of a bhikkhu who attempts intercourse in connection with other organs (apart from the three orifices), or with insentient things such as dolls, these are the bases of *dukkata*. In the Vinītavatthu it is shown that a bhikkhu who desires sexual intercourse attempting it at any organ of a woman apart from the three orifices, is *saṅghādisesa*. Some cases clearly involving bodily contact, and some involving the same or intentional emission of semen, are not clearly distinguished but the *āpatti* approaching *pārājika* are laid down as only *thullaccaya* and

\* This expression, "be *pārājika*", "be *āpatti*" although incorrect according to Pāli grammar, is the common Thai idiom and also expresses the meaning well in English. ( *Translators* )



*dukkata*. In the Vibhaṅga are given such cases (as in Vinitavattu) involving saṅghādisesa, leading to the consideration that if there is a higher āpatti which can be inflicted, then that āpatti should be taken and imposed; for example, a bhikkhu attempts intercourse with some organ of a woman apart from the three orifices. Even if that bhikkhu approaches an offence of *pārājika*, only the penalty for *thullaccaya* can be imposed but his action has also involved 'bodily contact with a woman' and 'intentional emission of semen' so having acted in this way, these two *saṅghādisesas* forbidding this sort of behaviour, can be brought against him. This decision in Vinitavattu is reasonable and it should serve as an example for other training-rules.

Āpatti in this training-rule is *sacittaka* and therefore a bhikkhu who was assaulted while asleep, and one who was not pleased while assaulted, are not āpatti. Four kinds of bhikkhus, namely, *insane* – that is having no self-awareness, *delirious* – not knowing about himself, *suffering intense pain* so that he has no mindfulness, and *that bhikkhu who was the original doer* (of that action) and who was instrumental in causing the Exalted Buddha to establish this rule, none of these are āpatti in this training-rule and the same applies in all other rules. Though the *ādikammika bhikkhu* (the first doer) who was the cause for the establishment of a particular rule is not āpatti in that rule (he may fall into other offences). I shall not mention again these four kinds of bhikkhus but it must be understood that they are free of āpatti in every rule. I shall mention only certain bhikkhus who are exempt from āpatti in special cases.

## 2. The second sikkhāpada states:

Should any bhikkhu with intent to steal, take from an inhabited area or from a forest what is not given, the



taking of what is not given being of such a nature that on its account kings would have the robber arrested and either executed, imprisoned or banished (censuring him thus), "You are a robber, you are a fool, you are an idiot, you are a thief", (then) the bhikkhu taking anything not given of such a nature is defeated and no more in communion also.

In the Vibhaṅga, many kinds of valuables are mentioned. Here in this book, I shall arrange them in groups for the sake of clear understanding. Valuables mentioned in the Vibhaṅga may be divided into two groups, namely *samhārima* (movables) and *asamhārima* (immovables). The former refers to many kinds of domesticated animals such as sheep, goats and pigs, and then beasts of draught such as elephants, horses, oxen, buffalo and so on, all of which are called *saviññāṇaka* (having life), as well as referring to insentient materials called *aviññāṇaka* not being fixed in their place, as for example gold and silver, cloths and requisites for life, etc. *Asamhārima* (immovable) valuables refers directly only to land and indirectly to things located upon that land, such as trees and houses. Whatever valuables are held by a person as belonging to him, or those valuables not belonging to an individual but which are protected by someone in charge, such as public property common to all, as with the belongings of the sangha and shrine-belongings of the cetiya, those valuable things not having been given to a bhikkhu by the owners themselves, nor by men in charge of them, and not having renounced their right then any of these things are called 'what is not given' (*adinna*). With respect to the terms 'from an inhabited area or from a forest' (*gāmā vā araṇṇā vā*), it is assumed that those valuable things are still possessed by the owner. For example, gold and silver are left in some place, or cut timber is not drawn from the forest, such are things called 'what is not given'.



To take valuable things with intent to steal may be classified according to the nature of the things taken. Stealing *saṃhārima* (movable) things is fulfilled when they are moved from their place. There are many kinds of such valuable things:

I) The movable things of value having different bases resting on the ground, which are buried in the earth, set on the earth, hung in the air, placed on other things such as on a bed or railing, kept under water, or placed in moving things such as boats or vehicles. Now the *base* of the article is that area upon which it rests, for example, with a box, the bottom being in contact with some other thing, the area of the latter covered is called the *base*. If the article does not lie flat upon its base, for example, a table or chair with three or four legs then these are called the three or four bases. A bhikkhu who takes with intention of stealing when he just moves the article from its base, falls into *pārājika*. If the article concerned is placed upon another movable thing, such as aboard a boat, and (a bhikkhu) should move that base (such as a boat) on which the (coveted) thing is placed, he is also (*āpatti*, i.e. *pārājika*). Actions of this sort for easy remembrance are called *stealing*.\*

II) The thing concerned is carried by a man, having a limb of that man as its base, as upon the head, shoulder, waist, or held by the hand, and then a bhikkhu snatches away that thing with the intention to steal. When that thing is removed from its bodily base, he will be *āpatti*. For the sake of easy remembrance this type of action is called *snatch-and-run*.

---

\* Here and below, the venerable author has used idiomatic Thai words which summarize each class of 'taking what is not given'. It has been difficult to match these words with English equivalents. (*Translators*).



In the Vibhaṅga when commenting on the term 'bhāra' (load) it is said: when a bhikkhu carries others' property and has the intention to steal, such as another person's things carried on his head, removing them from that base to his shoulder, āpatti has reached the final state for him. But this is the same as things being kept for someone by bhikkhus, who if that thing is lost, must compensate. But āpatti should be laid down for him in another way. In comparison with civil law, if a bhikkhu does this action, the condition of stealing is not clearly committed by him: for instance, a bhikkhu is tired of holding an article and he changes the base, by changing hands and does so with a mind of good conduct. If the *avahāra* (the action of stealing) was committed in this way then a good man could be accused, so the above is not reasonable. Therefore, I understand that if a bhikkhu snatches away things carried by others this is called *snatch-and-run*.

III) Domestic and draught animals have their feet as their bases. A bhikkhu with the intention to steal, drives them or leads them and when their fourth foot has left its base, then a pārājika falls upon him. This is, for the sake of easy remembrance called *cattle-rustling*. If they are small animals which can be taken away by hand, such as chickens, and a bhikkhu with intention to steal drives them away, his action is included in 'rustling'. If he picks them up, his action is included in common *stealing*.

In the Vinītavatthu of this training-rule are explained two more categories of 'adinnādāna' which can be included in this group.

IV) A bhikkhu with intention to steal snatches away something which has fallen from a carrier. When a bhikkhu picks it up he is āpatti. For easy remembrance, this is called *grabbing*.



V) At the time of distribution a bhikkhu with intention to steal changes his ticket with that of another hoping to own the better and more valuable things which should belong to that other bhikkhu. When the ticket-changing is complete, āpatti falls upon him. To change counterfeit things for genuine ones is included here. For the sake of easy remembrance this is called *cheating*.

The stealing of *asamhārima* (immovable) things is determined when the owner gives up his claim, so that āpatti falls upon a bhikkhu at this point. For example, a bhikkhu without justification claims the ownership of another's land. The owner of it having less power and being unable to put forward his claim, then gives up his claim at that time the highest āpatti falls upon that bhikkhu. If the owner does not give up his claim and files a suit in court against that bhikkhu affirming his right, both parties bringing their evidence and witnesses, if the owner is defeated, then āpatti falls upon the bhikkhu. If a bhikkhu files a suit in court claiming land (to which he has no right) it will be the same as above. But the term 'owner is defeated' means that he is defeated in the highest court in which the suit is finished. For the sake of easy remembrance this is called '*defrauding*'. A bhikkhu who extends his boundary, laying claim to land of another, is āpatti when he has completed extending his boundary (as marked by fences, poles, etc). But it is possible that the owner might not know (of this extension), therefore it should also fall under cases of claiming the right upon land, but this point should be considered by Vinaya-experts. If a bhikkhu directly moves a fixed thing from the land such as cutting a tree or moving a house then when that action is complete, the highest point of āpatti is reached, in the same way as discussed with movable things.

There are more *avahāra* (actions of stealing) which should be determined by other conditions, that is to say, by the right and so forth.



A bhikkhu with the intention to steal takes a thing entrusted to his care and when the owner comes to take it back, the bhikkhu denies that he has kept it, or says that he has returned it to him. The bhikkhu has āpatti when the owner has been deprived of right, as given in the case of defrauding above. For the sake of easy remembrance this should be called '*peculation*'. If the question is raised here: "Why is this āpatti not determined by 'moving from the base?'", then the answer is that the *avahāra* determined to be āpatti by 'moving from the base' is aimed at things which a bhikkhu must compensate the owners for, that is to say, receive a penalty or return to owners when lost; while things entrusted to a bhikkhu are therefore his responsibility to return when lost and the āpatti falls upon him at the time when the owners cease to have any claim upon it and the bhikkhu is free from having to compensate for it any more.

A bhikkhu has been assigned as a caretaker of things kept in a certain place, such as a storekeeper-bhikkhu. Though he has the mind to steal regarding those things yet so long as things are not taken out of the recognized limits of their store-place, āpatti of pārājika does not fall upon him. When they are taken beyond the recognized limits of the store where they are kept, the āpatti reaches the final state for him. For the sake of easy remembrance it should be called: *breach of trust*. This explanation is based upon the *avahāra* called *sankhetta-vītināmana* in the Commentary. There it is shown that a bhikkhu makes a condition like this: 'If a person sees me holding a thing within the limits (where it is kept) then I shall pretend just to be looking at it but if it has been taken beyond the limits (without others seeing me) then I shall steal it'. This consideration is not clear because at the time of making the condition a bhikkhu is not certain to have a stealing-mind.

A bhikkhu is carrying taxable things past the customs. Now if at that time when he is crossing the frontier he hides



them or has many things hidden but shows only some part of them, then the āpatti falls upon him when he crosses beyond the frontier where the tax should be paid. For the sake of easy remembrance it should be called *smuggling*. This *avahāra* is different from all others. All the other *avahāra* are concerned with things belonging to others which bhikkhus try to get hold of but this *avahāra* concerns his own property for which he has to pay tax to the ruler of the country he is entering. This stresses that bhikkhus in general recognize the authority of the ruler of the country to collect tax. When bhikkhus have to enter, they pay duty according to the kinds of goods carried by them. An action like this is a fault among all people, so it is included in one of the *avahāra*, being called in Vibhaṅga, *suṅkaghāta*.

If a bhikkhu persuades other bhikkhus to rob and some do so and some do not, (having gone together in a group), then the āpatti falls upon all of them. This is called for easy remembrance: '*robbery*'.

Another three *avahāras* occurring in the Commentary should be mentioned here, that is: bhikkhus produce counterfeit valuables, such as money, (lit: silver and gold), false weights and measures and so forth and when these things are complete, the āpatti falls upon them. For easy remembrance it should be called: *false dealing*.

A bhikkhu is able to force others to give, just as a government official may collect tax beyond proper measure. The āpatti falls upon him when those things come into his possession. For easy remembrance this should be called: *exaction*.

Further, a bhikkhu intends to injure the owner of some property, so that he is compelled to give it to him. This action is called *extortion*, being included in the above but perhaps more clearly defined.



A bhikkhu sees things fallen down which he covers with soil or other things such as leaves, intending to steal, and he is āpatti at the time when he finishes such covering. For the sake of easy remembrance, it should be called: *hiding with intent to steal*.

It is not only when a bhikkhu steals but also when he orders another to steal as mentioned in any of the ways above, that there is āpatti. Therefore, āpatti in this training-rule can also be committed by order, this being called *sāṇattika*, while the āpatti which falls upon a bhikkhu who himself does evil is called *anāṇattika*, an example of which is found in the first *pārājika* [where even if a bhikkhu orders or incites another to commit sexual intercourse, the former will not be āpatti]. But it should be understood that to incite another to do (an action which will be āpatti) for the sake of another, is not the same as inciting another to do for oneself.

A bhikkhu with intention to steal incites another to steal something for him and the āpatti comes to a head (for the former) when the latter has finished the action he has been incited to do. This should be understood as follows: A bhikkhu without making conditions, incites another bhikkhu and the āpatti falls upon both together when the incited one is successful in stealing as desired by the inciter. When one bhikkhu has already incited another but before the commission of the stealing warned the second bhikkhu not to steal but the second upon his own volition goes on to steal, there is no āpatti for the former but āpatti falls on the latter. The following case should be understood in the same way: a bhikkhu specifies some article to be stolen but the incited bhikkhu steals instead another article, then the former is not āpatti while the latter is. A bhikkhu gesticulates (without speech), winks or blinks, or nods or shakes his head, and both will be āpatti when the one incited and directed by him successfully steals the desired article. If the incited bhikkhu being told



to steal at one time, steals at another and so has not followed his orders, he will be āpatti but not the inciter. An example of this sort can be seen where an order is given to steal in the morning or in the evening. Now take a case where there are many incited bhikkhus concerned. For example, Bhikkhu Red orders Bhikkhu Blue to tell Bhikkhu Black to steal some article, or the chain of orders may concern even more people, the āpatti coming to a head when the last bhikkhu incited has accomplished his orders without there being confusion in those orders. But supposing this occurs, as when Bhikkhu Blue does not tell Bhikkhu Black but tells Bhikkhu White instead, then there is then a case of confusion when the original inciter, Bhikkhu Red, is not āpatti but it comes to a head for the immediate inciter (Bhikkhu Blue) and the doer (Bhikkhu White). In the case where there are many concerned in a chain of command and one bhikkhu therein passes over one or more others, then āpatti comes to a head in the case of those who are in the chain and not for those who are passed over because the latter do not know.

A bhikkhu with the intention of stealing orders another to steal some articles but uses undefined terms when referring to the articles but in any case his terms are clear enough for the listener to understand his desire. The incited accomplice who steals the articles is āpatti and in this case the inciter also does not escape from āpatti. This explanation is based upon the *avahāra* named 'atthasādhaka' in the Atthakathā, meaning 'aim is accomplished' but in that Atthakathā it is not explained as above, but in two ways: The first is when a bhikkhu has ordered another 'When there is a chance to steal such-and-such an article, then steal it' – if such-and-such an article will certainly be stolen by the incited one without obstacles then the inciter is *pārājika* at the time of giving the orders while the incited one is *pārājika* at the time of having accomplished the theft. The second explanation of the



Atthakathā is: A bhikkhu drops an absorbent article into another's oil-pot with intention to steal oil. When the absorbent article leaves his hand he is āpatti. According to the former explanation, the inciter is *pārājika* before the accomplishment but this departs from the Pāli relating the components of accomplishment in this training-rule. Moreover, how can it be known that the incited bhikkhu will certainly steal according to the inciter's desire? The āpatti will not come to a head until the incited one has accomplished the action of stealing, so that this first explanation seems to be like playful talk! But perhaps there is a meaning which is not so obvious. I should like to raise a question here. Bhikkhu Red writes a letter to Bhikkhu Black who lives in a remote part of the country needing many days to reach, sending him counterfeit banknotes, asking him to put them into circulation, thereby making a large profit which is to be shared by them. While the letter and the banknotes are travelling but not yet reached Bhikkhu Black, Red dies, or, thinking to escape from *pārājika*, disrobes. After this, the letter with the notes reaches Bhikkhu Black and he puts them into circulation. Does the *pārājika āpatti* then come to a head for Bhikkhu Red or not? Leaving aside the death of Bhikkhu Red, the discussion should proceed thus: perhaps Mr. Red comes to ask for upasampadā again amongst the sangha, then will he be allowed to live as a bhikkhu or will he be rejected? According to the Commentary Ācariya's point of view, he should be rejected but the question is what type of avahāra should he be compelled to recognize. The Commentator falls back upon the term '*atthasādhaka*' but in fact to classify with the term '*pubbapayoga*' is more correct. But the Commentator classifies instead with the action of inciting. This *avahāra* is strange because it is neither acceptance nor denial. Vinaya-experts should consider this point. In the case of dropping absorbent material into the oil-pot of another, it is clearly seen that



the Commentator's explanation is wrong, because the āpatti should be determined when the absorbent material is taken out of the pot, this being included in the *avahāra* of moving an article from its base called 'stealing' (see above, I).

In the Commentary, the Ācariya mentioned twenty-five *avahāra*, all of which have different names but are explained vaguely. From among them there are some *avahāra* which are reasonable and these have been explained by me above. I shall not speak of the rest and those who wish to see them in detail should consult the *Pubbasikkhāvannaṇā*. There might be a question here: Why, if the Commentator had established those categories, did he explain them only vaguely? The answer is that those twenty-five were not established by him but were collected from the Pāli and from the national laws of those days, just as in mindfulness of the body, the thirty-two aspects mentioned in the *Visuddhimagga* are taken from the medical treatises of those days. In both cases the Commentators have not understood the technical matters and only explained what the letters and words suggest. The mistake here is easily seen to be this in the groups of *nānābhaṇḍapañcaka* and *ekabhaṇḍapañcaka* in each of which there are five *avahāra*, where the Commentator explained that the term *nānābhaṇḍa* concerns both living and non-living things while '*ekabhaṇḍa*' concerns only living things, that is, various kinds of animals. Having explained them in this way, when living things had been classified in one group, why then were not non-living things put in one group? Certainly this method would be better. It is true that explanation according to name can be done easily enough but it is very difficult to deal with the *avahāra*, which is the reason why the Commentator explains literally according to the meaning of '*nānābhaṇḍa*' (various things). I assume that both names suggest the number of valuable things. One thing having sufficient value to be basis for a *pārājika* āpatti, should a



bhikkhu steal it, is called 'ekabhaṇḍa'. A thing by itself not having sufficient value to be a basis for *pārājika*, is stolen by a bhikkhu in quantity so that those things altogether have value sufficient to be basis for *pārājika*, this being called 'nānābhaṇḍa'. The term *nānā* (various) refers both to many of the same kind of thing, as well as to many different kinds of things. The placing of *nānābhaṇḍa* in one group is done to prevent a thief excusing himself by saying that he has taken things each of which is not sufficient to be a basis for *pārājika* and so must receive *āpatti* according to individual articles, as many *āpatti* as there were articles. This excuse and the subject raised before it, are sufficient to show that the twenty-five *avahāra* classified in the Commentary are inconsistent.

The value of things stolen upon which an *āpatti* of *pārājika* is established also being a base for great crime in civil law, is mentioned in the Nidāna of the Vibhaṅga as 1 *pāda* (= 1 *baht*) but in the Word Commentary (*pādabhajaniya*) it is given as 5 *māsakas* according to the monetary standard of Magadha at that time. Now five *māsakas* equal one *pāda*, and four *pādas* are one *kaḥāpana* which was the monetary standard of those days, as the Siamese baht is the standard of today. Money used in different countries has different value, having different rates of exchange. The standard of money in Magadha at that time is difficult to determine by comparing it with standards current today. To compare the *pāda* of Magadha with the *baht* of our country now cannot be done merely on the basis of their having the same name! There is however, an easier way to decide. In the *Tīkā* it is said that the *kaḥāpana* is a gold measurement equal to that of twenty *māsaka*, one *māsaka* is equivalent to gold weighing four rice-grains and a *pāda* therefore being a 1/4 *kaḥāpana* equals 5 *māsaka* and thus is equivalent to 20 rice-grains in weight. This comparison is not stable being subject to fluctua-



tions of the rates of gold and money. This matter is fully elaborated by Phra Amarābhīrakkhita (Amara Gert) in his book *Pubbasikkhāvannaṇā* and those who wish to refer to it should consult the final pages of his book. But it should be understood that at the time when the *Pubbasikkhā* was composed, the price of gold compared to the price of money was 16 units. Therefore the valuable things which are the base of āpatti in this training-rule, should be understood as follows:

Valuables to the value of 1 *pāda* or 5 *māsaka* are the basis of *pārājika*. Those valuables less than 1 *pāda* but more than 1 *māsaka* are base of *thullaccaya*. Those things having value of one *māsaka* and less than one *māsaka* are the basis for *dukkata*. In the Commentary it is said that the value of old or used things becomes less. Even though they are new the estimated value (of an object) should depend upon the current prices in that country and that time when an article was stolen by a bhikkhu. Though one article is valued less than that necessary for a base of *pārājika*, yet when several things (stolen by him) are valued together, the higher āpatti can fall upon a bhikkhu, as discussed in the section called 'nānābhaṇḍa' above. A bhikkhu with intent to steal takes an article valued at 1 *pāda* or more than that and he is *pārājika*. A bhikkhu intending to steal, takes something of value less than 1 *pāda*, then an āpatti according to the value of the article stolen comes to a head.

A bhikkhu with intention to steal tries to take a valuable thing which is a base of *pārājika* but that action of his is not successful. For example, he tries to steal a boat which is secured by a padlock. While he tries to undo the padlock, he is frightened by someone approaching and runs away. In this case a lighter āpatti according to his effort should fall upon him. This



kind of āpatti is that of 'pubbapayoga' which means 'before accomplishment of stealing' and those āpatti should be understood according to effort as follows:

When a bhikkhu comes to accomplish the theft he is *pārājika*. If he does not accomplish it but just moves the *saṁhārīma* (article) placed where it is usually kept, such as moving a boat to and fro even a little, when he tries to unlock it he is *thullaccaya*. Or in the case where a bhikkhu tries to steal domestic animals, when only the front legs have moved (but not the hind ones), he is *thullaccaya*. In the case of moving *asaṁhārīma*, such as cutting trees to steal them, when only one more stroke will suffice to chop it down, he is *thullaccaya*. In the case of defrauding land and peculation of things kept by bhikkhus, when a bhikkhu creates doubts in the owner's mind as to whether he can get it back or not at the time when he approaches the bhikkhu asking for its return, or the owner defeats him in court, then that bhikkhu is *thullaccaya*. Hence for the easy remembrance, it should be understood that only one step before the accomplishment of stealing is *thullaccaya* and before the *thullaccaya* comes to head, in all cases, the āpatti will be *dukkata*. If valuable things of less value than that required as a base of *pārājika* are stolen, in all cases the āpatti which comes in the *pubbapayoga* is *dukkata* [but I prefer to understand that this will be so except when there is a special training-rule, such as when a bhikkhu cuts down a tree etc., when he will be *pācittiya*]. But in the Vibhaṅga cutting a tree, plucking grass and digging the soil are all cases of *dukkata* as they are the *pubbapayoga* of taking what is not given. When there is a higher āpatti in the *pubbapayoga*, then that āpatti comes to a head, for example a bhikkhu tries to unlock the lock securing a boat, the *thullaccaya* comes to a head for him [it being understood that the boat has



been moved]. In this case a Vinaya-expert should make him aware that he has a *thullaccaya*, not a *dukkata*, on the grounds that he has walked towards and touched a boat (with intention to steal).

Āpatti in this training-rule is *sacittaka* therefore there is no āpatti for the bhikkhu who has no intention to steal, for there is knowingly taking an article in other ways (not intending to steal) as follows: taking with the understanding that it belongs to one-self; taking with the understanding that it is an article thrown away, called *paṇsakūla*; taking with confidence (as from a friend who will not mind, etc); or taking upon loan. If the article (which is taken) is protected by a *peta* or by an animal, for instance, the remains of an animal protected by a tiger which hopes to devour it as its next meal, then a bhikkhu taking such a thing is not āpatti. Due to this fact it is assumed that from ancient times to the present, human beings do not accept that animals have rights over food or other things accumulated by them, and that animals are valuables and are possessed by human beings. In the Vinaya it is accepted in this way although it is written that some animals are the base of taking what is not given, still here a bhikkhu taking from an animal is not āpatti.

In the Vinitavatthu there are two more kinds of *anāpatti*: A bhikkhu passes a customs-house not knowing that another man has hidden valuables in his bag without telling him. Though he has passed the customs, he is not āpatti. Another case is seen in the story of the supporter's family of Phra Pilindavaccha Thera which was robbed and two children carried off as hostages. Phra Pilindavaccha exercised his psychic power to regain those children and was not pārājika because (the Vinaya says that) it was within the range of his powers. With respect to the latter case, I prefer



to understand that the right (to the children) is possessed by the original owner and (Phra Pilindavaccha) helped to restore (their children) to them so there is no offence. If my understanding is right, it will get rid of wrong understanding and superfluity in this matter and will be also an example of a decision.

### 3. The third sikkhāpada states:

Should any bhikkhu purposely deprive a human-being of life or provide him with a (life-) taking sharp weapon or recommend advantages in death or encourage him to kill himself; who should (in fact) recommend advantages in death or encourage him to kill himself in various ways with such thoughts in mind and such intentions in mind as, "Good man, what (good) is this miserable life to you? Death is better for you than life", (then) he is defeated and no more in communion also.

By the body of a human being is meant that which appears in the womb of the mother at the time of conception, lasting until the time of death. During this time it is called a human being's body. To deprive of life means to cut off the continuity or to bring to an end its life in various ways, which should be understood as follows:

I) *Killing by direct contact*: cutting with a sword or instruments, piercing with a spear, or striking with a cudgel or stick.

II) *Killing at a distance*: shooting with arrow or gun, launching a spear, throwing a stone.

III) *Arranging something to kill*: laying a trap of sharpened spikes or a pit-trap covered with leaves, or a trap with a heavy weight which will fall and kill, giving some harmful substance to kill (including poison) and so on.



IV) *To kill using magical knowledge (vijjā)* examples of which are given the Commentary – as when a bhikkhu recites various *mantra* or *āgama* calling upon demons, ghosts and spirits and then sending them to make others sick and die. In the present time we could explain it by killing with the electric power which a bhikkhu has developed through occult knowledge.

V) *To kill with supernatural power (iddhi)* as in the example given in the Commentary, when a bhikkhu had developed the ability to kill by 'the weapon-eye' [which is the attribute of the Yama-god] and when he got angry he would stare at others expecting to kill them. Examples in the present are not found but because snake-poison is called '*nāgariddhi*' a bhikkhu who frees a poisonous snake or a tiger in order to kill another, or even injects animal poison into the veins of another to kill him, these actions probably may be included in this category and are also not repetitions of the above. They differ from the third category, arranging to kill, because the method used is not fixed in one place; and from the fourth because it is not developed through the power of knowledge but through the power which exists naturally in animals.

A bhikkhu while not murdering by his own hand, may order another to kill for him, which is also called 'to deprive a human being of life' so *āpatti* in this training-rule is *sāṇattika*, guilty also by commanding another. The explanation of this training-rule should be compared with the method given in *ādinmādāna*.

Moreover, a bhikkhu having power may bring weapons or other things and hand them over to another, or place them near to another whom he expects will be killed and then force another to commit suicide, as seen in the Chinese classics. Or he has seen



his friend who suffers severely and incurably with great pain and experiences very strong feelings so he feels sympathy for him and decides to help him get rid of suffering and so brings weapons, etc., or not doing this he recommends the advantages of death or persuades him to kill himself so that he searches about for weapons by himself: with all these causes there is the same guilt. Recommendation or persuasion may be done verbally or physically, for example by writing a letter. Again, the term "taking a sharp instrument" is taken only as an example, since he may use another kind of weapon to destroy his life. And it should be understood that if there is only "taking a sharp instrument" or the recommending and persuading about the advantages of death, so that he does not destroy his life, then *āpatti* does not come to a head, in the same way that there is no *pārājika* when a bhikkhu himself attempts to kill but his victim does not die.

A human being is the base of this *pārājika*. Beings which are called '*amanussa*' (non-human), variously *yakkha* (demon), *peta* (ghost) and animals which have power to disguise themselves as human beings, are the base of *thullaccaya*. According to this point, it is probable that ordinary animals should be the base of *dukkata* but there is a separate training-rule against killing animals which is a *pācittiya* so there is confusion over this sequence. If one agrees with my line of thought there would be no confusion. A bhikkhu attempts to kill a human being and he does accomplish it — he is *pārājika*. If he does not accomplish the killing but only injures, he is *thullaccaya*. If he does not go as far as that, he is *dukkata*. A bhikkhu attempts to commit suicide, he is *dukkata*. A bhikkhu attempts to kill other beings and he is *āpatti* according to the base. The *āpatti* coming in the *pubbapayoga* before accomplishment are all *dukkata*.

This training-rule is *sacittaka* therefore *āpatti* does not come upon a bhikkhu who has not the intention to kill, such as a bhikkhu working upon high places where a heavy thing falls



from his hand and kills another person below. Or, in the case of a bhikkhu attending upon another with a high fever and giving to the latter an overdose of medicine which the patient could not swallow, so that he vomited and died. And in the case of a bhikkhu who does not know that there is poison in the food which he gives to another, so that the latter dies. If a man dies in these ways, even though it is through the effort of a bhikkhu, he will not be āpatti.

#### 4. The fourth sikkhāpada states :

Should any bhikkhu while having no acquaintance of it suggest that (some) superior human state worthy of the Noble Ones' knowledge and vision is present in himself (saying) "I know thus, I see thus" and afterwards on another occasion should he, whether examined or not examined, having fallen into the fault and being desirous of purification, say thus, "Friends, not knowing, I said 'I know'; not seeing, I said 'I see'; what I said was vain and false", (then) unless it was through over-estimation, he is defeated and no more in communion also.

The Vibhaṅga gives too many terms as '*uttarimanussadhamma*'. If I repeat them here I am afraid that inconsistencies would appear and if I should give only their names, then it would be useless, being interesting only as a list of topics for those who read this subject anyway. Hence, I shall give only a brief description. *Uttarimanussadhamma* means first, states superior to human experience (treating '*uttari*' as adjective of '*dhamma*'), and second, states of superior human beings (treating '*uttari*' as adjective of '*manussa*'). Both meanings are agreed upon as correct. Human beings of that time esteemed the methods of training the mind in *samādhi* and the methods of purifying the mind of passion as the highest knowledge, because the most superior results were based upon training the mind in these two methods.



The method of training the mind in *samādhi* should be understood thus: the well-trained mind can see clearly both *attha* and *dhamma* so that whatever is undertaken will be well-accomplished but usually the mind is obstructed by mental objects known as the Hindrances (*nivaraṇa*). They are five in number: craving for sensual pleasures called *kāmachanda*; the state of restless ill-will caused by *dosa* (aversion), conducive to inflicting harm upon others at its greatest development when called *byāpāda* (irritation (*paṭigha*)→aversion (*dosa*)→anger (*kodha*)→ill-will (*byāpāda*)); the state of sloth and torpor, laziness and drowsiness called *thīna-middha* because it is the cause of the shrunken state of mind; *uddhacca-kukkucca*, the state of distraction, or quick fading of mind is a cause of mental disturbance and disruption; then there is scepticism and hesitation called *vicikicchā*. To free the mind from these hindrances and to make the mind concentrated is called *samādhi*. The lower state of *samādhi* is not complete, where concentration is called access-concentration (*upacāra-samādhi*). The higher state of *samādhi* in which the mind is fully concentrated is called *appanā-samādhi*. The first of these is common to ordinary people and is not called *uttarimanussadhamma*. The higher *samādhi* possessed by superior men is held to be *uttarimanussadhamma* which is mostly known as *jhāna*. In the *Vibhaṅga*, there are four *jhānas* according to the terms used in Buddhist Dhamma. They are called *rūpa-jhāna* because they have a certain kind of *rūpa-dhamma* as their object. They are known by the cardinal numbers from first to fourth, which are in Magadha-language: *paṭhama*-, *dutiya*-, *tatiya*-, and *catuttha-jhāna* in which there are the following qualities: *Paṭhama-jhāna* has five factors: *vitakka* (thought-conception), *vicāra* (thought-examination) - these two are common to all people but they do not include *kilesa-kāma* and *akusala-dhamma*. Then there is *pīti* (joy) and *sukha* (happiness) which result from solitude and comprise



*ekaggatā* (one-pointedness of mind). Second: *dutiya-jhāna* comprises three qualities: abandoning *vitakka-vicāra* so that there remains only *pīti* and *sukha* which results from *samādhi* and *ekaggatā*. Third, *tatiya-jhāna*, comprises two qualities abandoning *pīti* so that only *sukha* and *ekaggatā* remain. Fourth, *catuttha-jhāna* comprises only two qualities: leaving *sukha* so that only *upekkhā* and *ekaggatā* remain.

These four *jhāna* are included as one type of *uttarimanussa-dhamma*.

Moreover, the mind which is free from *kilesa*, the defiling objects of mind, is the important root-cause of purified practice, of happiness and of *mettā-karunā* (loving-kindness-compassion) which in turn becomes the cause of striving for the welfare of others. Therefore, one who has a pure heart is much venerated by other people. I shall give an illustration here. Good and calm-minded people are beloved and respected by all people and if their compassion is greater still, how much more will they be loved and respected? The purity of mind can be temporarily developed as when one subdues anger and then later it arises again, since something has arisen which irritates. It can also be permanently developed, that is to say, one has got rid of certain *kilesa* which have completely ceased to exist and do not arise again. This latter is highly esteemed as *lokuttara-dhamma* which means the reality beyond this world, or the quality that is beyond the range of the worldly plane. This *lokuttara-dhamma* comprises four each of *magga* (path) and *phala* (fruit), together with *Nibbāna*, nine in all. Those who want to understand this, should learn first about the ten Fetters or *saññojana* by which the hearts of beings are bound: 1) *sakkāya-diṭṭhi* - the view which is the cause of holding that there is self; 2) *vicikicchā* - scepticism which is the cause of hesitation and doubt regarding the path of practice; 3) *sīlabbata-parāmāsa* - the belief in magic, ritual and ceremonies with the belief that magic power beyond normal would be produced by



such rites; 4) *kāma-rāga* - craving for sensual pleasures, sometimes being called only '*rāga*'; 5) *paṭigha* - the agitation of mind that is irritation by the power of aversion (*dosa*), being called directly '*dosa*' in some places. These five are the lower or gross fetters known by the name of *orambhāgiyasaññojana*. 6. *Rūpa-rāga* - the attachment to *rūpa-dhamma*, as with one who is delighted with particular persons or things, even among the objects of *rūpa-jhāna*; 7) *arūpa-rāga* - attachment to *arūpa-dhamma* such as attachment to pleasant feeling (*sukha-vedanā*); 8) *māna* - the state of conceiving 'I am this, I am that'; 9) *uddhacca* - unaimed, distracted thinking, such as thinking of things beyond the ordinary range; 10) *avijjā* - delusion which is the cause for not knowing the truth. These five are the higher or subtle fetters known as *uddhambhāgiyasaññojana*.

*Ñāṇa*, knowledge, which is the cause of getting rid of these fetters is called *magga* (path). It is divided into four categories according to its power of getting rid of partial or complete fetters as follows:

1) *Sotāpatti-magga* - the cause of getting rid of the first three fetters above; 2) *Sakadāgāmi-magga* - the cause for getting rid of the above three and for lessening the strength of greed, aversion and delusion; 3) *Anāgāmi-magga* - the cause for getting rid of the five *orambhāgiya-saññojana*; 4) *Arahatta-magga* - the cause for getting rid of all the ten *saññojana*.

With respect to the above subject, *Sakadāgāmi-magga* is not clear as are the other *magga* but stands between *Sotāpatti-magga* and *Anāgāmi-magga* and the term 'to lessen' *rāga* and *dosa* is really uncertain since it is not clear to what extent they are weakened. It can only be suggested that strong *rāga* and *dosa* are certain to lead to *apāya* (woeful states), since *kāmesu-micchācāra* and *byāpāda* cease to exist from the attainment of



sotāpatti-magga. This means that those who attain this do not commit the various kinds of sexual misconduct and do not take revenge upon others but they still have wives and husbands according to the family tradition and still get angry; while *anāgāmi-magga* gets rid completely of *rāga* and *dosa* which means that those who are *anāgāmi* are brahmacariya not being engaged in sexual intercourse and do not get angry with anybody. *Rāga* and *dosa* weakened by *sakadāgāmi-magga* still exist but they are not so strong. Due to this matter, I shall explain that *rāga* and *dosa* exist in the latter but rarely or in a subtle manner but it is not clear to what extent they exist. It is not clear to what extent *moha* is weakened by *sakadāgāmi-magga*, although it is destroyed completely by *arahatta-magga*, therefore this matter also is not clearly defined.

The mental objects resulting from the attainment of *magga*, or the enjoyment of the fruits produced by *magga*, are called *phala*. According with the *magga*, there are four *phala*. It is possible to illustrate this by way of similes: The fetters are like a disease of the body, *magga* is like medicine to cure disease, while *phala* is like the happiness gained through the cessation of disease. There is another simile: Fetters are like the robbers in the forest, *magga* is like the suppression of the robbers, while *phala* is like the peace resulting from the non-existence of the robbers.

The cessation of the *khandha*, namely: *rūpa* (materiality) and *citta* together with the *cetasika* (mind and mental qualities), still remaining after the cessation of *kilesa* at *Arahatta-magga*, in which there is no fuel, is called *Nibbāna*. It is possible to illustrate this: the Noble Persons who have become *Arahat* are called *Arahanta* (having the qualities of an *Arahat*). They do not go to be reborn in another plane of existence as do ordinary beings after death and this is called the attainment of *Nibbāna*.



Both *jhāna* and *lokuttara-dhamma* are the subjects of *uttarimanussadhamma* which have been elaborated in the Vibhaṅga. All other names are the synonyms of these two groups of dhammas. The names differing from the above such as *bodhipakkhiyadhamma* which came in the Magga-bhāvanā portion of the Vibhaṅga, refers to Dhamma conjoined with *magga*. The term *attupanāyikaṃ* (that which is present in himself) means 1) boastfully saying 'I have attained such and such dhamma from such and such a time'. When a man whom a bhikkhu talks to in this way understands the meaning of his words, the āpatti of pārājika comes to a head for that bhikkhu. 2) A bhikkhu speaks to no particular person or in public, and when among them one person understands, that bhikkhu is pārājika, whether a man believes him or not makes no difference. 3) When a man does not understand what the bhikkhu has said, as in the case of a foreigner speaking a different tongue, that bhikkhu will be *thullaccaya*.

A bhikkhu suggests his attainment of *uttarimanussadhamma* indirectly, as when he mentions the physical marks, requisites such as bowl and robes, dwellings and so on, saying 'A bhikkhu who has such and such physical marks using such and such bowl and robes and living in this or that district'; or mentions whatever can make the listener understand as referring to himself (that he has attained), and when a man understands, he is *thullaccaya*, but when he does not understand he is *dukkata*.

Āpatti in this training-rule is *sacittaka* and therefore there is no āpatti which falls upon a bhikkhu who speaks with the misunderstanding that he has attained something, or upon a bhikkhu who does not desire to suggest his attainment of *uttarimanussadhamma*, as when a bhikkhu reads the training-rule dealing with *uttarimanussadhamma* having the purpose to instruct others, etc.



When a bhikkhu breaks any of these four *Pārājika* training-rules, he has no right to live with the bhikkhus as he did previously. He is defeated and no more in communion. Even though he would be ordained again by the sangha, he will not be a bhikkhu according to the Vinaya, on account of his life. Āpatti in these four training-rules are *atekicchā*-meaning incurable, are *anavasesa*-with no remainder (of bhikkhuhood), and are *mūlaccheda*-cutting off the root (of the bhikkhu-life). A bhikkhu should never commit these āpatti.

## CHAPTER V

### SAṄGHĀDISESA

This term is the name of an āpatti meaning the fault which has *Sangha* at the beginning (*ādi*) and at the end (*sesa*). This means that the Sangha functions as those who determine the fault and order the guilty bhikkhu to observe *mānatta* (penance) and *parivāsa* (probation), and afterwards the Sangha lifts the āpatti from the bhikkhu. It is also the name for training-rules which, if they are broken, will bring the āpatti of *saṅghādisesa* to a head. Here it is the name of thirteen training-rules which are as follows:

*Nine Established at once upon being Āpatti*

#### 1. The first sikkhāpada states:

Intentional emission of semen, except in a dream, entails initial and subsequent meeting of the Sangha.

The term 'emission of semen', points out that the semen is not emitted by itself but through the effort of a bhikkhu. 'Intentional' means that the action was brought about by the desire to emit it. The term 'except in a dream' means without intention and without effort. Though there might be both of these in a dream, they would be *abbohārika*, that is to say, insignificant or as *though they were not*.

Accordingly, in the Vibhaṅga the steps of āpatti have been classified like this: a bhikkhu intends, makes an effort and semen is emitted-these three are factors of *saṅghādisesa*. A bhikkhu intends and makes effort but semen is not emitted-these two are the factors of *thullaccaya*. It seems as though intention by itself



would be a factor of *dukkata*, but *āpatti* is not brought about by mind alone as I have said above, hence intention here is not a factor of *āpatti*. Therefore there is no *dukkata* in this training-rule. In this training-rule it is merely said that emission of semen is made with intention but there is no mention of the cause leading up to that action. Therefore if a bhikkhu desires contact, or desires to be free from oppressive illness, or longs in other ways besides this, and he had intentionally made effort, that is, made effort either with his own genitals or else with those of others [except in such a way as to be a base for *pārājika*], or if he makes effort with inanimate objects or even by shaking the lower part of his body in the air, when the semen is emitted (with the above effort) he is *saṅghādisesa*. If he should make effort but semen is not emitted, he is *thullaccaya*.

This training-rule is concerned with doing for himself, therefore *āpatti* here is *anāṇattika*, but if a bhikkhu orders another to make effort for him, he does not escape from *āpatti*. As it is *sacittaka*, the *āpatti* does not come to a head for a bhikkhu who does not desire to emit semen, as when the semen is naturally emitted at the time of sleep.

## 2. The second sikkhāpada states:

Should any bhikkhu, lustful, with perverted thoughts, engage with a woman in bodily contact or holding of hands or holding of tresses of hair or touching some (bodily) member, this entails initial and subsequent meeting of the Sangha.

The term '*otinno*'-lustful, is explained by the Commentator as 'to be lustful in fondling'. It was explained in the method of the Commentator that if a bhikkhu is lustful for sexual intercourse

and touches a woman's body, such action is the *pubbapayoga* (fore-accomplishment) to sexual intercourse and is the base of *dukkata*.

According to my opinion, to have lust in any way is the same, (whether in touching a woman's body or in intercourse). In the *Vinītavatthu* of the first *pārājika* it is rightly said that a bhikkhu who has intercourse with any of a woman's organs other than the three orifices (genitals, anus, mouth), is *saṅghādisesa*, not *dukkata* as the *pubbapayoga* of sexual intercourse. In the *Vibhaṅga*, the composer uses neutral words and does not specify (as to whether touching with lust should be *dukkata* under the first *pārājika* or *saṅghādisesa* under the second *saṅghādisesa*), meaning that to have lust while touching a woman in either case is the same. In the *Vibhaṅga*, '*mātugāma*' in this training-rule is defined as human females even if they have just been born. Here, his explanation is correct because male lust can be exercised upon even small girls.

'Woman' is the base of *saṅghādisesa*. *Paṇḍaka* (sex-aberrants such as hermaphrodites, homosexuals and those deficient in sexual organs) is the basis of *thullaccaya*. Man, male and female animals, are the bases of *dukkata*. Concerning the base of *saṅghādisesa*, a bhikkhu having lust comprehending that a person is a woman and touching her, when his body touches hers, he is *saṅghādisesa*. Even though the woman touches him first and he is pleased, he is still *saṅghādisesa*. A bhikkhu having lust and comprehending in another way (that she is a man, etc) touching her he is *thullaccaya*. He reaches out to touch things connected with a woman's body, such as her clothes; or else he extends things connected with his body to touch her body, as when a bhikkhu makes his robe touch a woman's body: for easy remembrance, one side is *body* and the other *things connected with the body* and he will be *thullaccaya* in every case. A



bhikkhu extending things in contact with his body having touched a thing connected with a woman's body or throwing things such as flowers upon a woman's body, or upon things in connection with her body is *dukkata*. A bhikkhu understanding that what he has touched is something other (than a woman, while it is a woman) but not by direct contact is *dukkata* for every effort. Concerning the base of *thullaccaya*, if a bhikkhu has not completed the base for that, he is only *dukkata*, so it is not necessary to speak about the base of *dukkata*. If a bhikkhu touches many bases there will be many *āpatti* according to the kind and number of those bases. If a bhikkhu makes many efforts, there will be many *āpatti* according to the number of efforts.

A bhikkhu who is carried away by lust and desires to fondle, has the base of woman as his aim, so the *āpatti* in this training-rule is *sacittaka*. Therefore, no *āpatti* falls upon a bhikkhu who has no intention to touch. For example, a bhikkhu gives way to another and collides with a woman; or a bhikkhu is absent-minded and a woman comes into collision with him so he is alarmed and pushes her away; or a bhikkhu touches others unknowingly as when passing through a crowd; or lastly a bhikkhu is first touched by a woman but he is not pleased with the contact: these conditions are all in the category of *anāpatti*, because he has no lustful intention.

### 3. The third sikkhāpada states:

Should any bhikkhu, lustful, with perverted thought, address a woman with lewd words as young men (address) a girl with (words of) invitation to sexual intercourse, this entails initial and subsequent meeting of the Sangha.

The term "mātugāma" in this training-rule is explained in the Vibhaṅga as a human girl who is sophisticated enough to

understand the lewd words. This explanation is correct because one who has the intention to speak lewd words aims at a woman understanding them. If she is a small girl and she is not sophisticated, the aim of the speaker will not be realized. The lewd words mean words concerning genital organs, anus and sexual intercourse, praising, blaming, questioning or teasing, for instance, "You have such and such organs" – with the purpose of insinuating or else asking for sexual intercourse for himself. Questioning or counter-questioning about the experiences of sexual intercourse undertaken by her with her husband, instructing or telling her to commit sexual intercourse with her husband, saying "You should do so in such and such a manner" (are also included in 'lewd words').

Woman [one who has the marks of womankind in this training-rule] is the base of *saṅghādisesa*. *Paṇḍaka* is the base of *thullaccaya*, man is the base of *dukkata*.

With womankind, speaking about genitals, anus and sexual intercourse are the boundary of *saṅghādisesa*. Talk about other organs above the knees and under the whorl of the hair on the head [up to the base of the neck and above the elbows], are the boundary of *thullaccaya*. Limbs other than this are the boundary of *dukkata*. Speaking with a *paṇḍaka* about both 'doors' (for urine and faeces) and about sexual intercourse are the base for *thullaccaya*. All limbs are the base of *dukkata*. In man, everything is the base of *dukkata*.

A bhikkhu speaks to many people, then there will be many āpatti for him according to the kind and number of their bases. A bhikkhu speaks to one person but in many words and very likely there will be an āpatti for each word spoken but this is not stated here.

This training-rule is *sacittaka*, therefore there is no āpatti for one who desires to teach Dhamma or to give instruction (in Vinaya, etc.) and who speaks lewd words in doing so.



#### 4. The fourth sikkhapāda states:

Should any bhikkhu, lustful, with perverted thoughts, speak in a woman's presence in praise of ministering to his own sensuality, inviting sexual intercourse thus, "Sister, the highest kind of ministering is this, namely ministering with this (sexual) act to a virtuous, lofty-natured observer of the Brahmachariya such as I am", this entails initial and subsequent meeting of the Sangha.

All explanations should be understood as those given above (in the third *saṅghādisesa*), The difference here is the aim of the speaker: above, the aim is to woo using lewd words, but here the aim of the bhikkhu is to invite.

#### 5. The fifth sikkhāpada states:

Should any bhikkhu engage to act as go-between for (telling) a man's intentions to a woman or (telling) a woman's intentions to a man whether about marriage or about paramourage, (or) even for a temporary (arrangement), this entails initial and subsequent meeting of the Sangha.

The Pāli of this training-rule omits the term 'bhāsento' 'telling' or other such words, which is in fact inserted in the Vibhaṅga. The term 'about marriage' means lawful living together (as husband and wife). The term 'about paramourage' means unlawful living together (as man and his mistress, or woman and her lover). Therefore, in the Vibhaṅga, the writer speaks of two kinds of women. First, one protected by her parents etc. from whom a man lawfully requests or lawfully takes her as his wife, that is to say, she is a wife by marriage, one who has agreed to live with a man without a formal ceremony, or she is a wife who is purchased with money. Secondly, the prohibited

women, such as a woman protected by family as a princess in a royal family etc, a woman protected by Dhamma as a bhikkhuni and the woman protected by law, as mentioned in the old law on the widowed concubine of a previous king. Among these women if a bhikkhu accepts the post of marriage-broker, going to request a woman's hand for a man or accepts to act as a messenger to urge them to marry each other, or help them in other ways he is *saṅghādisesa* in doing this.

In the Vibhaṅga, the messenger factor has been divided into three categories. Accepting the words of the one who asks; then second, going to tell the other party; and third, returning to inform the original requester. But sometimes the fruit (of *saṅghādisesa*) results from two factors, for example, a man asks a bhikkhu to make an appointment with a prostitute saying that she should meet him at such and such place and time. If the prostitute accepts that appointment though the bhikkhu does not return to inform that man who asked him, their desire is surely fulfilled. Considering the term '*vā*' in the training-rule, one should understand that if it did not occur, there would always be three factors, that is to say, the phrase, "conveying a man's intentions to a woman" points out that a bhikkhu has already accepted the request of the man and gone to inform a woman; and the phrase, "conveying a woman's intentions to a man" points out that a bhikkhu goes to inform a man of the words spoken by a woman and so there are the three factors above. But in this training-rule there is clearly the term '*vā*' which points out that a bhikkhu may only accept the words of one party and then go to inform the second party, thus getting only two factors. It is assumed by me that the Vibhaṅga-composers have classified according to three factors in accordance with the way usually practised by people, such as the marriage-broker appointed by the man's party who was sent to request (from parents) the hand of



a woman in marriage. He would return to inform the man's party of whatever was spoken by the woman's party. When three factors had been established (by the Vibhaṅga-composer), then he had to classify two factors as the basis of *thullaccaya*, and thus one factor becomes the base of *dukkata*, irrespective of whether it is practical or not. The superfluous factors classified by the Composer can be seen in some places, such as in the Fourth *Pārājika* training-rule. He has classified "musāvāda" into three factors: first, before speaking a man knows that he will tell a lie; second, while speaking that man knows that he is telling a lie; and third, when he has spoken, he knows that he has told a lie. But concerning the boast about *uttarimanussadhamma*, it will be accomplished by the first two of the factors above. This matter has already been noticed in the *Atthakathā*.

I prefer to understand that the 'action of going between' as stated in this training-rule will be fulfilled by linking two parties with a message and this is more reasonable. The *āpatti* in *pubbapayoga* will be seen thus: if someone asked a bhikkhu and the latter accepted his request, then he is *thullaccaya*. And if a bhikkhu then informs the other party he is *saṅghādisesa*. If a bhikkhu undertakes this affair by himself then when he informs the first party, he is *thullaccaya* and when he informs the second, he is *saṅghādisesa*. Therefore, upon making the first effort a bhikkhu is *thullaccaya* and this can also be seen in other training-rules because there is no possibility of committing anything less.

One who asks a bhikkhu may be the youth or the girl, or their parents, or other important people connected with them at whose request a bhikkhu accepts to go and inform the other party who may be the youth, girl, parents or others, as above. A bhikkhu doing this is *saṅghādisesa*. A bhikkhu who does not undertake this by himself but orders another man to carry out this for him, will still be *saṅghādisesa*.

Someone requested many bhikkhus and they all accepted his words but among them only one actually informed but all are *saṅghādisesa*. A bhikkhu tries to persuade a husband and wife who have been divorced to remarry, not knowing of their previous state, but he does not escape from āpatti. Therefore āpatti in this training-rule is *acittaka*. Husband and wife who have quarrelled and who are living separately but are not divorced, and whom a bhikkhu then tries to reconcile, in trying to do so, he will not be āpatti.

#### 6. The sixth sikkhāpada states:

When a bhikkhu is having a hut constructed (with means got) by his own asking and with no (lay) owner (to build and give it) and destined for himself it must be constructed by him according to the (prescribed) measurements. The measurements are these: in length twelve spans of the sugata-span, across seven, (being) inside (measurements). Bhikkhus must be assembled to appoint a site and by those bhikkhus an unoccupied site must be appointed with a surrounding area. Should a bhikkhu have a hut constructed (with means got) by his own asking on an occupied site and with no surrounding area, or should he not assemble bhikkhus to appoint a site, or should he exceed the (prescribed) measurements, this entails initial and subsequent meeting of the Saṅgha.

The meaning of this training-rule is rather obscure so that it is difficult to understand, needing full explanation. It is necessary to discuss the site first. Because the saṅgha can appoint the site it seems as though the land appointed by the saṅgha will be that within an *ārāma* or surrounding the *ārāma*. The *ārāma* of those days was not like those of the present. The saṅgha was not in authority over the land but its owners took care of it, while



it was simply made available as the dwelling-place of the saṅgha. Moreover, in some places it is said that the land appointed is not in an *ārāma* or in the surrounding of an *ārāma*. The term 'occupied' (*sārambha*) leads me to understand that it is a place already occupied by people, or else people have the latent right over it. For bhikkhus to re-occupy (such land) or to occupy land in such a way that it overlaps boundaries is clearly prohibited in the *simā* declaration. But in the Vibhaṅga, 'occupied' is explained as a place with the dwellings of small creatures such as ants or white ants; or of beasts such as elephants, tigers etc; or as being closely connected with the fields, farms, plantations, or buildings of others; or it is crowded, such as places near populous areas or main roads. But if this matter is defined thus, then it will be very difficult to find a suitable place for a *kuṭi* either in the forest or village! Why is it defined like this? The Pāli term *sārambham* means literally 'initiating, just beginning', but it has been explained as above by the writer of the Vibhaṅga.

I understand that the area (surrounding the *kuṭi*) is for marking the boundary according to the recognized code for land as mentioned in the ancient *Mānavadharmasāstra*, the name given to the ancient Siamese code of law. To provide a surrounding area as the boundary is clearly set forth in the *simā* declaration. In the Vibhaṅga it is clearly explained as the area where a cart drawn by yoked oxen can go round or where ladders can be taken round. What is the reason why this matter has been explained thus? I realize that this is because the Pāli '*saparikkamanam*' means literally 'stepping round', while (the Vibhaṅga's composer) lays stress upon *ease of building* but not upon the other meanings. Our discussion up to this point leads us to conclude that a (suitable) place will not be occupied by anybody and that it is not prohibited; it is forest, empty. The action of asking the saṅgha to appoint a site is so that there are witnesses and evidence and to provide a boundary in accordance with the national code of law. Having considered the tradition

of the present, we shall understand this well: A bhikkhu wishes to establish a (temporary) bhikkhu residence but he must first ask the head bhikkhu of the sangha in that area to give permission. Meanwhile, the head of the sangha there will consider whether the applicant is a suitable person to occupy or hold the right over that land or not, and whether the bhikkhus' residence will overlap the claims of others or not. Then, (having investigated) he will allow the establishment of that residence but if things are not proper, he should not give his permission. This tradition (of the present time) is based upon this training-rule.

Now we come to discuss the kind of *kuṭī*. The Pāli in this training-rule only mentions '*kuṭim*' which means a certain kind of *kuṭī* but in the Vibhanga it is said that it is plastered [with clay or lime]. I am not sure why the Vibhanga says this but there are some words which led me to decide this matter. In the story of this training-rule, a bhikkhu asked for clay and could not finish (his work on the *kuṭī*) because he constructed it without limits (adding to it as he went on). If the important point of this story concerns the plot of land where the *kuṭī* is established, the kind of *kuṭī* is not important. The important point concerning the *kuṭī* is only that it should not be established beyond the limitation (of size). This is prohibited so as to limit requests for materials.

There is a question here: If the important point concerns the plot of land, why in this training-rule does the establishment of the *kuṭī* play an important role? The answer is because at that time, the land had no price but people were allowed to occupy some land to prevent quarrelling. Let alone ancient times, even in the present day (2456/1913) the revenue collection on the Sangha-land (in Siam) is done according to the number of roofs of houses and not according to the area of land. The surrounding area is not counted and the area where houses cannot be established is not considered. With this in mind I have said that the meaning of this training-rule is obscure so that it is difficult to understand.



Now we come to deal with the limitation in the size of a *kuṭi*. The limitation uses the *Sugatapamāṇa*. It is understood that this measurement is from the (length of) the fingers of the Master's hand. It is possible that when Lord Buddha laid down the training-rule concerning this measurement, of necessity He demonstrated this with the span of His own fingers, the 'kheup', (a span between the tip of the thumb and the middle finger both fully extended), and the fore-arm (the 'sork' = approx 2 kheup, from the tip of the middle finger to the elbow). But when the term '*sugata*' is considered, a term never used by the Buddha referring to himself, nor by his disciples referring to him, I wonder whether this word has another meaning, for instance: the fully-extended kheup, or the royal measure of those days, or the name of another measurement such as the 'carpenter's inches' (in Siam) or the (English) inches of a foot. This is just a matter of surmise for there is no evidence that I could find. Moreover there is the term '*sugatapamāṇa*' of the robes of the *Sugata*, so it is advisable for us to consider that it is the measurement derived from the fingers of the Master's hand. Even so, the method of determining the length of the *sugatapamāṇa* should be investigated. I shall explain about this in a separate chapter (see Chapter X). In this training-rule or in others therefore I shall only mention the terms *sugata-anguli* (= niew = inch) and *sugata-vidatthi* (kheup)

Now, we shall discuss the meaning of the phrase '*Sārambhe ce ... kuṭim kāreyya*'. This actually refers to *saṅghādisesa* but why then in the Vibhanga is it said that each of these (*sārambhe, aparikkamane, saññācikāya*) is a base of *dukkāṭa*? This is impossible to understand! If the Vibhanga's explanation is correct, then for what purpose was the above phrase spoken; moreover the conditional words '*vā*' (or) in the following phrases become useless [this will be seen clearly in the following training-rule which has only the one '*vā*']. Considering this, the land appointment is the duty of the sangha who should really appoint a good site. A bhikkhu builds his *kuṭi* in the wrong place when

he builds it in places other than the site appointed by the sangha for him. When holding this consideration in mind, it is clearly seen that a bhikkhu who requests the sangha to appoint a site but who then builds his *kuṭī* in another place, or who does not request the sangha to appoint the site, or who builds his *kuṭī* upon the site appointed by the sangha but who builds it beyond the limitations of size, in each case there is the base of *saṅghādisesa*. A bhikkhu who has done only one of these things, commits only one āpatti; two things, two āpattis. The āpatti in *pubbapayoga* is dukkata for each effort which is made until the time when only one thing remains to be done, when that bhikkhu is *thullaccaya*. He is *saṅghādisesa* when the actions are completed.

Āpatti in this training-rule can be committed because of what is not done, that is to say, he does not ask the sangha to appoint a site, and it can also be committed because of what has been done, that is to say, a bhikkhu establishes a *kuṭī* in a place other than that appointed, or establishes it beyond the limitation of size, or it can be committed in both these ways as when a bhikkhu does not ask the sangha to appoint a site *and* establishes a *kuṭī* beyond the limitation. If a bhikkhu requests the sangha to appoint a site and then establishes upon that land a *kuṭī* not beyond the limitation of size, he is not āpatti.

## 7. The seventh sikkhāpada states:

When a bhikkhu is having a large shelter constructed with a (lay) owner (to build and give it) and destined for himself, bhikkhus must be assembled to appoint a site and by those bhikkhus an unoccupied site must be appointed and with a surrounding area. Should a bhikkhu have a large shelter constructed on an occupied site and with no surrounding area or should he not assemble bhikkhus to appoint a site, this entails initial and subsequent meeting of the Sangha.



The term 'vihāra' is at present understood as a central place, because the Buddha-image is installed there as though it was a place where Lord Buddha was still dwelling. However, the term 'vihāra' in scriptures refers to the dwelling-place of bhikkhus but the difference between it and a *kuṭī* are not described. In the Vibhanga, the term 'vihāra' is explained as a plastered building just as a *kuṭī* is described in the previous training-rule. The difference between this and the previous training-rule is that in this one there is a lay-owner and so there is no limitation because a bhikkhu does not have to trouble the public by his requests for help. All explanations besides these should be understood as in the previous training-rule.

#### 8. The eighth sikkhāpada states:

Should any bhikkhu, being angry, desirous of venting anger, and displeased, accuse a bhikkhu groundlessly of a case of Defeat (thinking) "Perhaps with this I may make him fall from the Brahmachariya", and afterwards on another occasion whether he is examined or not examined that legal process is (shown to be) groundless and the bhikkhu admits to anger, this entails initial and subsequent meeting of the Sangha.

As I have said previously, it is sanctioned by the Master as the duty of a bhikkhu first to (make efforts) to free himself from āpatti and if he does not do so, it will be the duty of another bhikkhu to warn him personally, for the sake of his own welfare. If he remains stubborn, a bhikkhu should accuse him in the midst of the sangha for the sake of the Buddhasāsana. The bhikkhu in this training-rule utilizes this Buddha-allowance and accuses a bhikkhu whom he hates. The *adhikaraṇa* (legal process, see Ch. IX) in this case is *anuvāḍādhikaraṇa*, that is the accusation that a bhikkhu has committed an āpatti in a certain training-rule. Groundless *adhikaraṇa* means: matters which have not been seen, heard or suspected. Matters which have been seen by a bhikkhu himself,

or which have been reported by others and which a bhikkhu has grounds to believe, are also called 'grounded'. Although it has not been seen directly nor reported by others, but the action of another causes suspicion to fall upon him – this is also 'grounded'. The words of accusation should be understood by the accuser when he tells what has been committed by the accused, or when he mentions the āpatti, or when he prohibits dwelling together (*samvāsa*), or when he does not accept *sāmīcikkamma* (services rendered by a junior to a senior bhikkhu), and his words must be clear enough to understand that the accused has committed *pārājika*. In the Vibhanga, the words of accusation are explained as being spoken by the accuser in the presence of the accused according to the tradition practised at that time. The Atthakatha Ācariya perhaps held this tradition so he explained that if the accusation was done in the absence of the accused, āpatti does not come to a head. I contend that the accusation made by speech or one made by written report (by body) are included within the term 'accusation', and that the accusation will come to a head at the time when the accuser spoke or handed a report to an official, for example when Mettiyā Bhikkhunī accused Phra Dabbamallaputta Thera to the Master in the story of this very training-rule. Why do I contend in this way? Because the accusation made by body can also fulfill the conditions and moreover, at the present time it is more in evidence than accusations made by speech and because the accusation intended to make the other fall from brahmachariya must be submitted to an official. A bhikkhu tells the accused himself or tells another bhikkhu with the purpose of spreading about the ill-repute of another bhikkhu and this (since it is not a report to authority) is called accusation in the absence of authority in which case the accusation does not come to a head. The accused bhikkhu, the defendant, must be told so that he knows what he has been accused of at the time of the hearing regarding the accusation (*adhikaraṇa-vinicchaya*) which is a part of *sammukha-vinaya* (see - Ch. IX).



*pari* : A bhikkhu himself accuses or orders another to accuse a bhikkhu with a groundless charge of *pārājika* : he is *saṅghādisesa*. A bhikkhu accepting an invitation to accuse another of a groundless charge of *pārājika* is also *saṅghādisesa* (and the originator of the groundless charge is *saṅghādisesa*). In the case of an unfirm accusation made firmer by the accuser, as when, although the matter has only been reported to him, the accuser says that he has seen it, then he is also *saṅghādisesa*. In the case of the firm accusation actually made unfirm by the accuser, then what *āpatti* comes to a head for him? In the Vibhanga, it is said that this *āpatti* is also *saṅghādisesa*! But I understand that it is impossible for the accusing bhikkhu to do this as he hopes to destroy the accused, so why should he make his accusation unfirm? In the case of a well-founded accusation, such as when a bhikkhu himself has seen (the offence) but he is not sure who is the guilty party and so cannot identify him—but accuses him firmly that he has seen him clearly—he is also *saṅghādisesa*. It is said in the Vibhanga that when the accused bhikkhu is not pure and has actually committed *pārājika* but the accuser thinks that he is pure and charges him with an unfounded charge of *pārājika*, then the accuser is *saṅghādisesa*. In this case the Vibhanga (composer) is correct in his decision because the standard is based on a bhikkhu who still declares himself a bhikkhu. In addition, it is a tradition that the accusing bhikkhu who is going to accuse a bhikkhu in the latter's presence, should first ask his permission. If he does not do this, he is *dukkata*. Hence, the Vibhanga (composer) also raises this point for discussion in the Vibhanga. This tradition should be practised even when a bhikkhu accuses in the absence of the accused, informing the accused so that he knows this matter beforehand. Some attorneys (in civil law) also practise in this way.

*pari* : The accusing bhikkhu who understands that a bhikkhu whom he accuses is not pure, whether the accused bhikkhu is pure or not and accuses upon the grounds of what he has seen, heard

or suspected, even if his accusation is not true, for example he has received false information, is not āpatti.

In this training-rule, the Commentator did not mention the lesser āpatti in serial order (*anuloma-āpatti*). It is probable that if a bhikkhu (falsely) accuses another of *sanghādisesa*, *thullaccaya* would fall upon him but there is a separate training-rule laying down only a *pācittiya* (Pāc. 76). This matter causes us to assume that the *anuloma-āpatti* have been established later.

#### 9. The ninth sikkhāpada states :

Should any bhikkhu, being angry, desirous of venting anger, and displeased, accuse a bhikkhu of a case of Defeat, using as a pretext some point of a legal process connected with another class (of fault, or connected with another person's fault, thinking) "Perhaps with this I may make him fall from the Brahmacariya", and afterwards on another occasion whether he is examined or not examined (and whether he is believed or not), that legal process is (shown to be) connected with another class (of fault) and the bhikkhu admits to anger, this entails initial and subsequent meeting of the Sangha.

The phrase 'connected with another class' means it concerns another person, or it means that it is connected with the accused himself. The phrase 'using as a pretext some point of *adhikaraṇa* (legal process) connected with another class' may be seen in the following example: the accusing bhikkhu has seen a man of white or black complexion, or of tall or short appearance, committing some fault which it is proper to charge and this man resembles the one to be accused. The accusing bhikkhu cites what he has seen vaguely like this: "I have seen such and such a man of such and such an appearance like the accused commit this or that fault", the accuser understanding that that bhikkhu could be the accused, so he accuses him as though he has seen or suspected. In another case, he who is described bears the same name as the accused and so because the accuser has heard that a man of that name has



done this or that, he then charges the one whom he wishes to accuse. The phrase 'using as a pretext some point of *adhikāra* connected with the accused' for example means that an accuser knows that the accused has broken some training-rule though not as serious as *pārājika*, but he magnifies it in his accusation to become *pārājika*. Other explanations should be understood as in the previous training-rule.

*Four Established upon the Third Announcement.*

#### 10. The tenth sikkhāpada states:

Should any bhikkhu attempt to cause a schism of the Sangha when it is in concord and should he undertake and endeavour in and persist in a legal process conducive to schism of the Sangha, that bhikkhu should be admonished by bhikkhus thus, "Let the venerable one not attempt to cause a schism of the Sangha when it is in concord, let him not undertake and endeavour in and persist in a legal process conducive to schism of the Sangha. Let the venerable one be at peace with the Sangha; for when the Sangha, being in concord and in agreement and without dispute, holds undivided recitations (of the Pāṭimokkha etc.) then it lives in comfort". Should that bhikkhu, being admonished by bhikkhus thus, endeavour as before, then that bhikkhu should be remonstrated with by bhikkhus, (that is, the announcement in the Sangha to stop a bhikkhu from such action) up to the third time so that he may relinquish (his endeavour). If on being remonstrated with up to the third time he relinquishes (his endeavour), that is good; if he should not relinquish it, this entails initial and subsequent meeting of the Sangha.

'Sangha' here means a group of bhikkhus. The term 'concord' means those who have the same *saṃvāsa* living in the same *sīmā*. The phrase 'attempt to cause a schism of the Sangha when it is in concord' means to attempt to make a

separate group, so that the bhikkhus come to have different *saṃvāsa*, that is, they do not perform uposatha and saṅghakamma together. The phrase, '*adhikaraṇa* conducive to schism of the sangha' means making a quarrel—'This is Dhamma, that is not Dhamma; This is Vinaya, that is not Vinaya,' etc. This may be seen in the story of Phra Devadatta who attempted to separate from the Master's Sangha and establish a new one.

It is the duty of bhikkhus who have learnt about this to intervene while bhikkhus who have heard (of such an attempt) and do not intervene are *dukkata*. If a bhikkhu promotes schism and has been warned but does not believe or pay attention, he should be dragged into the midst of the sangha and admonished three times. If he still persists in promoting schism, he should be remonstrated with, that is to say, the announcement to prohibit by the order of the sangha, by the procedure of *ñatticatutthakamma*. If the promoter of the schism does receive the prohibition, relinquishing at first (his intention), this is called 'good'. When the promoter of the schism does not relinquish (his intention), *dukkata* comes to a head for him at every time throughout the *ñatti*. At the end of the first two *anusāvanā* he is *thullaccaya*, and *saṅghādisesa* at the end of the third and last *anusāvanā*. When he becomes *saṅghādisesa*, the *āpatti*, coming before (in *pubbapayoga*) will be dissolved.

In saṅghakamma which is righteous and correct according to procedure, if a bhikkhu does not relinquish (his intention to promote schism in the sangha), whether he understands rightly, is doubtful or misunderstands, he is nevertheless *saṅghādisesa*. Therefore, *āpatti* in this training-rule is *acittaka*. In saṅghakamma which is not righteous, it is said that this entails *dukkata* for him. This can be seen in a saṅghakamma which is not correct according to procedure though its aim may accord with what is righteous.

#### 11. The eleventh sikkhāpada states:

There may be bhikkhus who are followers of that bhikkhu, say, one or two or three, and who speak on his side and they may say thus, "Let the venerable ones not admonish



that bhikkhu at all; for that bhikkhu is a speaker of the Dhamma and a speaker of the Vinaya and he speaks in accordance with our desire and choice, he knows (our minds) and speaks (for us) and that is our wish". Those bhikkhus should be admonished by bhikkhus thus, "Let not the venerable ones say thus; for that bhikkhu is neither a speaker of the Dhamma or a speaker of the Vinaya. Let not schism of the Sangha be the venerable ones' choice too. Let the venerable ones' (mind) be at peace with the Sangha, for when the Sangha, being in concord and in agreement and without dispute, holds undivided recitations (of the Pāṭimokkha, etc) then it lives in comfort". Should those bhikkhus, being admonished by bhikkhus thus, endeavour as before, then those bhikkhus should be remonstrated with by bhikkhus up to the third time so that they may relinquish (their endeavour). If on being remonstrated with up to the third time they relinquish (their endeavour), that is good; if they should not relinquish it, this entails initial and subsequent meeting of the Sangha.

It appears that the Pāli of this training-rule omits words or is incomplete in some places, for example: 'he knows our—' (= *jānāti*) refers to wish or desire, or else it omits some terms such as '*citta*' or '*ajjhāsa*' (mind, character) so here the term 'mind' has been inserted by me in order to cover the meaning not only of mind but also of wish or choice. In another place the phrase 'Let the venerable ones' (*āyasmantānaṃ*) be at peace with the Sangha' omits a certain term in the singular, referring to one thing and so I have again inserted the word 'mind': 'Let the venerable ones' mind .....'. But comparing this with the previous training-rule, it should be held that it is incomplete. Therefore, the words should be: 'Let the venerable ones (*āyasmanto*) be at peace with the Sangha'

Explanation in this training-rule should be understood as given in the previous one but there is a difference in that the sangha who recite the remonstrations should comprise only two or

three bhikkhus since more than that are prohibited from reciting the remonstrations at one time. Here it is explained that, bhikkhus four in number are simply known as a sangha. One sangha undertaking kamma in regard to another sangha is impossible as it is against the pattern of the Vinaya.

**12. The twelfth sikkhāpada states:**

A bhikkhu may be naturally difficult to admonish and when lawfully admonished by bhikkhus concerning the training precepts included in the recitation, he makes himself unadmonishable thus, "Let the venerable ones not admonish me at all about either what is good or what is bad, and I too, shall not admonish the venerable ones at all about either what is good or what is bad. Let the venerable ones refrain from admonishing me". Then that bhikkhu should be admonished by bhikkhus thus "Let the venerable one not make himself unadmonishable; rather let the venerable one make himself admonishable. Let the venerable one lawfully admonish bhikkhus, and bhikkhus will lawfully admonish the venerable one; for the Exalted One's following comes to growth thus, that is to say by mutual admonishment and by mutual rehabilitation". Should that bhikkhu, being admonished by bhikkhus thus, endeavour as before, then that bhikkhu should be remonstrated with by bhikkhus up to the third time so that he may relinquish (his endeavour). If on being remonstrated with up to the third time he relinquishes (his endeavour) that is good; if he should not relinquish it, this entails initial and subsequent meeting of the Sangha.

**13. The thirteenth sikkhāpada states:**

(It may be that) a bhikkhu who is a corrupter of families (by gifts of flowers etc.) and of bad behaviour lives in dependence on some village or town (and that) both his bad behaviour is seen and heard about and families corrupted by him are seen and heard about. That bhikkhu



should be admonished by bhikkhus thus, "The venerable one is a corrupter of families and of bad behaviour. Both the venerable one's bad behaviour is seen and heard about and families corrupted by him are seen and heard about. Let the venerable one leave this abode. You have live here long enough". Should that bhikkhu, being admonished by bhikkhus thus, say to those bhikkhus, "The bhikkhus are guided by desire and guided by aversion and guided by delusion and guided by fear. On account of the same fault they banish one and do not banish another", then that bhikkhu should be admonished by bhikkhus thus, "Let the venerable one not say so. The bhikkhus are not guided by desire nor guided by aversion nor guided by delusion nor guided by fear. The venerable one is a corrupter of families and of bad behaviour. Both the venerable one's bad behaviour is seen and heard about and families corrupted by him are seen and heard about. Let the venerable one leave this abode. You have lived here long enough". Should that bhikkhu on being admonished by bhikkhus thus, endeavour as before, then that bhikkhu should be remonstrated with by bhikkhus up to the third time so that he may relinquish (his endeavour). If on being remonstrated with up to the third time he relinquishes (his endeavour) that is good; if he should not relinquish it, this entails initial and subsequent meeting of the Sangha.

The term 'corrupter of families' is one way of speech used of a group of bhikkhus. It does not mean that a bhikkhu gets angry, takes revenge, injures or destroys another's wealth. The meaning is that a bhikkhu flatters (lay-people) by behaving as a layman, or by serving laypeople, or by hoping for gains, giving a little to get much, — by doing this a bhikkhu is called a 'corrupter of families' because he makes laypeople decline in faith which is the cause for the fulfilment of skilfulness (*kusalasampatti*). Although a bhikkhu behaving like that may

please some laymen, yet they will not respect him as a bhikkhu, only as an inferior friend. The term 'of bad behaviour' refers to the behaviour beyond the bounds of a samana's conduct, for instance, playfully associating with girls in a family, or playing games, naughtiness or joking, or singing and dancing. Lord Buddha allowed the sangha to inflict an act of banishment (*pabbājanīya-kamma*) upon a bhikkhu who behaves like this. A bhikkhu who is under *pabbājanīya-kamma* should realize his fault and regain his good behaviour so that the sangha will put an end to that banishment. Instead of doing this, the bhikkhu in this training-rule blames other bhikkhus saying that they are guided by desire and so on (the four *āgati*), which is why Lord Buddha allowed the sangha to recite the remonstrations, and if he does not pay attention to it he is *saṅghādisesa*.

#### Summary.

Among these thirteen rules of *saṅghādisesa*, the first nine are called *paṭhamāpattika* which means that they are āpatti immediately upon their commission. The latter four are called *yāvataṭṭhika* meaning that they are āpatti at the end of the three remonstrations recited by the sangha. A bhikkhu who breaks any one of these thirteen training-rules, is *saṅghādisesa*.

It is a tradition for a bhikkhu who is *saṅghādisesa* to inform, regarding his faults, a sangha comprising at least four bhikkhus (*catuvagga*) and then ask to observe the procedure called *mānatta*. When the sangha has recited the permission, a bhikkhu should observe *mānatta* properly for six nights after which he requests *abbhāna* from a sangha which must comprise twenty bhikkhus (*vīsativagga*). When the sangha has recited *abbhāna* approving the cessation of the āpatti, he again becomes pure. But if a bhikkhu who is *saṅghādisesa* has concealed his āpatti and has not told other bhikkhus of it, he has to observe the procedure named '*parivāsa*' for as many days as he has concealed the āpatti. After that he observes the procedure of *mānatta* according to tradition.



A bhikkhu who has committed an āpatti and has realized that he has committed an āpatti and thought to conceal it and has not told other bhikkhus of it until one or many days have passed, is called 'a bhikkhu who has concealed his āpatti'. Although a bhikkhu does not think to conceal it, there may be some obstacles preventing him from telling others of his āpatti, as in the case of a bhikkhu who has been punished by *ukkhepanīya-kamma* (act of ostracism) so that nobody associates with him, or there are dangers such as wild animals infesting the way so that he cannot travel even at night, or there are floods and no boat is available, so although one or more days have passed, obstructed in these ways a bhikkhu is not guilty of concealing his āpatti. But when a bhikkhu learns that the obstacles no longer exist so that he can tell others, he has to inform other bhikkhus as soon as possible. This *saṅghādisesa-āpatti* is the most weighty among the curable āpatti, so it is called *garukāpatti*, or since there are many āpatti concerned with indecency, it is called *duṭṭhullāpatti*. A bhikkhu who commits any of them can be purified by observing the above mentioned procedures, hence it is called *vuṭṭhānagāminī* (leading to rehabilitation).

## ANİYATA

This term means 'uncertain'. It is a name of *vītikka-* meaning breaking or trespassing against an established rule, here meaning 'uncertain *vītikka*'. It is a name for training-rules, the breaking of which implies 'uncertain āpatti'. There are only two of them.

### 1. The first sikkhāpada states :

Should any bhikkhu seat himself together with a woman, one man and one woman privately, on a screened seat convenient (for sexual dealings) in such wise that a woman lay-follower whose word can be trusted having seen (them) would say that it constituted one of three cases, namely, one of Defeat, or entailing Initial and Subsequent Meeting of the Sangha, or Expiation, then

provided that the bhikkhu who was sitting (there) concurs he should be dealt with under one of the three cases, namely, Defeat, or entailing Initial and Subsequent Meeting of the Sangha, or Expiation, and he should be dealt with under whichever one that woman lay-follower whose word can be trusted should say. This case is indefinite.

The meaning of this training-rule is very obscure so that it is difficult to understand, moreover the Vibhanga-arrangers do not explain it clearly but only in summary saying that whatever a woman lay-follower speaks about, let the authorities then hear the bhikkhu's statement as perhaps her words may be mistaken. It may happen that although a trustworthy person comes to inform saying that he or she has seen such and such take place, yet he/she does not intend to accuse any bhikkhu for he/she may have made a mistake regarding the people concerned, and the authorities may not consider or enquire first from the bhikkhu concerned, and thus hastily inflict the penalty upon that bhikkhu. This would not be righteous behaviour by the theras. This can be clearly seen in the case of a mother whose son is accused by others and is hastily punished by her without enquiry, — and this cannot be called a good method. But if we rely upon the statement of the bhikkhu rather than upon that of the *upāsikā*, then the adjectival phrase "whose words can be trusted" of the *upāsikā* becomes meaningless because if greater value is placed on the statement of the bhikkhu then less value must be given to the report of the *upāsikā* and to state these two matters in two conditional sentences (with the verb 'vadeyya') becomes meaningless. I understand that the adjectival phrase "whose words can be trusted" is said to point out the testimony of the speaker in order that the authorities will believe in it, as when a mother punishes her son who is accused by another but later it is realized that it is not really just (to do like this). Then the Arranger (of the Vibhanga) explained that an "*upāsikā* whose words can be trusted" means *ariyasāvikā*



(at least a stream-enterer), which is defining it upon an excessively high level. As regards the remarks here about the two conditional sentences, the first one states that the *upāsikā* does not say definitely that a bhikkhu has committed such and such but only says that he would have committed one of the three *vītikkama* and this being so, if the theras cannot gather the truth from other sources, then they have to inflict the penalty upon him according to that bhikkhu's statement. This should be held as the pattern for making a settlement of *adhikaraṇa* without a witness. The latter sentence points out that if an *upāsikā* definitely says that a bhikkhu has done such and such, though the bhikkhu does not accept (that accusation), the theras should inflict that penalty according to her statement. This matter should be held hereafter as a pattern for the settlement of *adhikaraṇa* according to the subject which has been considered and according to how much trust should be placed in the witness' statements even if the accused (bhikkhu) denies the charge.

## 2. The second sikkhāpada states :

(It may be that) the seat is not convenient (for sexual intercourse, but that) it is convenient for addressing lewd words to a woman. Should any bhikkhu seat himself together with a woman, one man and one woman alone, on such a seat in such wise that a woman lay-follower whose word can be trusted having seen (them) would say that it constituted one of two cases, namely, entailing Initial and Subsequent Meeting of the Sangha, or Expiation, then provided that the bhikkhu who was sitting (there) concurs he should be dealt with under one of the two cases, namely entailing Initial and Subsequent Meeting of the Sangha, or Expiation, and he should be dealt with under whichever one that lay woman follower whose word can be trusted should say. This case also is indefinite

There are two kinds of secluded place: one where there is an obstruction (such as a screen or wall) so that one cannot see,

such a place being convenient for sexual intercourse called in short, 'a place out of sight' as mentioned in the first training-rule. The second place which is open but nevertheless distant is convenient for addressing lewd words to a woman, and is called in short, 'a place out of hearing' as found in this training-rule. The posture of lying down is included in the base of this *āpatti* while the posture of standing is the base of *anāpatti*. The rest of the explanation here should be understood as in the above training-rule.

These Aniyata training-rules should be held as pattern for the settlement of the occurrent *adhikaraṇa*.

If someone accuses a bhikkhu and that accusation is true because that bhikkhu has committed that offence, then that accusation must be considered and judgement given as to the appropriate penalty (but if not true, why should it be considered?) If that accusation does not lead to any *āpatti* then it should not be considered. When that *adhikaraṇa* being considered before the authorities is a matter of one accuser and one accused and if there is no witness, then the authorities should listen to the bhikkhu. If there is a genuine witness then he should be given a hearing in the procedure of examination and the authorities should inflict a penalty on a bhikkhu, even though he denies (the charge).



## CHAPTER VI

### NISSAGGIYA PĀCITTIYA

The term '*pācittiya*' means the *vīṭikkama* or breaking of precepts which causes wholesomeness (*kusala*) to fall down, that is *āpatti*. Perhaps it means the *vīṭikkama* that one should be afraid of doing and it is the name of both *āpatti* and training-rule. The term '*nissaggiya*' means forfeiting or abandoning, that is to say, whatever is the cause of the *āpatti*, that should be forfeited and being translated in this way, is the adjective of *pācittiya*. If it is the adjective of material things, then it means 'things which should be forfeited'. Both terms coming together have the meaning: 'the *vīṭikkama* named *pācittiya* causing forfeiture'. When it is the name of a training-rule it means the penalty coming to a head and having this name.

The training-rules of this chapter are thirty in number being divided into three sections with ten training-rules in each. This method of division (*vagga*) is used both in Vinaya and in Sutta, ten Suttas composing one *vagga*.

#### I. CĪVARA-VAGGA - the Section on cloths, first.

##### 1. The first sikkhāpada states :

(During a time) when (stored-up) cloth (made up into robes or not\*) is finished up (by its being either all made up into robes or destroyed etc.) and when the *kāṭhina* (privileges) are in abeyance, an extra cloth can be worn

---

\* The Pāli word '*cīvara*' has the meaning of both pieces of cloth and the 'robes' of a *bhikkhu* cut according to the prescribed pattern from them (Translators' note).

(or kept) by a bhikkhu for ten days at the most. When he exceeds that it entails expiation with forfeiture. (1)

It is the tradition for bhikkhus at the time of the last month of the rainy season to replace (one or more of the) three robes (*cīvara*) so it is the season for donors to offer (made-up) robes and pieces of cloth and thus that time is called *cīvara*-giving-time, or just *cīvara*-time. At that time a bhikkhu who has passed the Rains-residence, has the privilege to keep as much cloth as he wishes in order to make up complete new *cīvara*. If bhikkhus have taken part in *Kāṭhina* then that privilege is extended to the end of the winter season (i.e. for four months, until approximately March). A bhikkhu who has not taken part in *Kāṭhina*, or his *cīvara* has been made, or has not been made (in case there has been no donor to offer *Kāṭhina*) until the season had past, or a bhikkhu who has the benefit to observe *Kāṭhina*, but he has done something which is the cause why he cannot hold the benefit of those who will take part in *Kāṭhina*, such as when he has left his Wat not meaning to return, or the period of the *kāṭhina*-privileges had past: in such cases a bhikkhu can hold an extra *cīvara* for ten days at the most.

*Cīvara* are allowed to be made of six kinds of material: *khomaṃ*—made of tree-bark or plant-fibres such as linen, *kappāsikaṃ*—made of cotton as the cloth used ordinarily, *koseyyaṃ*—made of silk of various sorts, *kambalaṃ*—made of wool (except human being's hair) such as 'scarlet' (the old term for a red woollen material), *sāṇaṃ*—made of hemp, *bhaṅgaṃ*—made of mixed materials such as cotton with silk and so on. Cloths which are made of these kinds of material being more than eight inches in length and four inches wide, being determined as the cloth 'vikapped' by a bhikkhu, are called *cīvara* (but see the following rule). Lord Buddha allowed bhikkhus to have numbers of *cīvara*, some of which are determined by number such as, the '*tri-cīvara*' also called '*adhiṭṭhāna-cīvara*' (those determined as the three robes) and besides the above, those which are not 'vikapped', that is to say, shared by two owners, are called *atireka-cīvara*.



The root of the verb 'dhāretabbam' means 'hold' and in the earliest times seemed to mean 'to wear' or 'to put on' but since the auxillary rule (*anupaññatti*) for keeping ten days at the most came into being, it covers the meaning of 'having privilege over it'.

The period for keeping *atireka-civara* is reckoned as finished at the time of dawn. A bhikkhu who keeps *atireka-civara* for the full period of ten days until the dawn of the eleventh day is nissaggiya pācittiya. This āpatti can be cured when a bhikkhu forfeits the things (*civara* or material) which have caused it. The bhikkhu concerned can forfeit (the *civara*) to a *sangha*, that is to a group of four (or more) bhikkhus, or to a group of two or three bhikkhus (*gaṇa*) or to an individual bhikkhu. As it is possible to forfeit robes properly to an individual, I cannot see the necessity hidden here for the (Vibhaṅga-composer) to talk about forfeiture to a *sangha* or to a *gaṇa*. Therefore, at the present time no one observes this. The *civara* being within *hatthapāsa*, the words of forfeiture to an individual bhikkhu are as follows:

IDAṂ ME BHANTE CĪVARAṂ DASĀHĀTIKKANTAṂ  
NISSAGGIYAṂ, IMĀHAṂ ĀYASMATO NISSAJJĀMI.

If the speaker is older (as a bhikkhu) than the hearer then he should say ĀVUSO in place of BHANTE. This procedure should be understood as the same in the following training-rules. The Pāli given above means: "This my *civara*, Venerable sir, has passed ten days and is to be forfeited, I forfeit this *civara* to you". If there are many *civaras*, two or more they can be forfeited at the same time but the Pāli should be changed into the plural forms, as follows:

IMĀNI ME BHANTE CĪVARĀNI DASĀHĀTIKKAN-  
TĀNI NISSAGGIYĀNI, IMĀNĀHAṂ ĀYASMATO  
NISSAJJĀMI.

The translation is the same but refers to more than one *civara*. Things being beyond *hatthapāsa* can also be forfeited by

saying ETAM̐ in place of IDAM̐, and ETĀHAM̐ in place of IMĀHAM̐; ETĀNI in place of IMĀNI and ETĀNĀHAM̐ in place of IMĀNĀHAM̐. When a bhikkhu determines that he will forfeit a cīvara he should resolutely abandon it. When he has forfeited it, then he confesses his āpatti. If a bhikkhu who is the hearer takes it away, the former owner cannot reclaim it but it is a good tradition with the hearer that when he has accepted the forfeited article, he returns it to the former owner. If he does not do so, he is dukkaṭa. The Pāli words for returning such articles are as follows:

### IMAM̐ CĪVARAM̐ ĀYASMATO DAMMI.

which means, "I give this cīvara to you". The Pāli terms referring to many cīvara or those out of *hatthapāsa* should be changed accordingly. If a cīvara which is nissaggiya and still not forfeited is worn by a bhikkhu, he is dukkaṭa, while a bhikkhu who uses a cīvara which has been forfeited and has been returned to him is not āpatti.

In this training-rule, there are no words pointing to intention so it is said that āpatti is *acittaka*. Though a bhikkhu carelessly keeps it beyond ten days, he is nevertheless āpatti. If within ten days a bhikkhu has made *adhiṭṭhāna*, 'vikapped' it, or lost it, or it has been destroyed, or it no longer belongs to that bhikkhu, he is not āpatti. Therefore, later on when there was necessity to be lenient regarding *atireka-cīvara*, Lord Buddha, in a separate section, allowed the bhikkhus to 'vikap' *atireka-cīvara*, that is, to place the cīvara under dual ownership as we find practised now. The procedure for *vikappa* will be explained separately (see Pāc. 59).

Here I should like to explain my opinion regarding this matter so as to be the basis for further investigation by Vinaya-experts. This training-rule is concerned with cīvara which can be worn but other passages say that cloth at least eight inches in length and four inches in width is held to be cīvara which should be 'vikapped'. So it is stated that even a small piece of material,



enough to stitch up as patchwork for making a cloth large enough to wear, is included as *cīvara* in this training-rule, and even coloured cloths which cannot be worn (by a *bhikkhu*) and cannot be changed (by dyeing or bleaching), all (cloths whatever) are held to be *atireka-cīvara*. But this way of explanation goes too far. I prefer to think that it is not *atireka-cīvara* even though there is an aphorism in Vinaya "*Strict practice of Vinaya, better than (loose)*". Here I think that it is too much. This matter can be seen for when a *bhikkhu* 'vikaps' those (small) things he will feel embarrassed.

## 2. The second *sikkhāpada* states:

(During a time) when (stored-up) cloth (made up into robes or not) is finished up (by its being either all made up into robes or destroyed, etc.) and when the *kāṭhina* (privileges) are in abeyance then if a *bhikkhu* should live apart from his three robes even for a single night without the consent of *bhikkhus*, (an act of the Sangha) this entails expiation with forfeiture. (2)

The three robes (*ticīvara*), refer to: i) the *antaravāsaka*, that is the under-robe, ii) the *uttarāsaṅga* or upper-robe, and iii) the *saṅghāṭi* or covering-robe. These three *cīvara* are allowed by Lord Buddha for the *bhikkhus*. Sometimes as in summer, the three *cīvara* would be more than are needed, as with the robe called *saṅghāṭi*. *Bhikkhus* are then satisfied with two *cīvara*, the *antaravāsaka* and *uttarāsaṅga* when they travel here and there. But there would also be times when they need to have the complete three *cīvara* such as in winter, so the number of *cīvara* should be great enough to meet their needs. With the intention of letting *bhikkhus* have a complete set, the Master has laid down this rule. Even then He accepted that two *cīvara* were convenient at some times and at some places for some *bhikkhus*, so He allowed *bhikkhus* to live apart from their (full) set of robes for some time, for example when *bhikkhus* have observed the three months Rains-residence or have already taken part in *Kāṭhina*. Also, the Exalted Buddha allowed *bhikkhus* to

announce *ti-civara-avippāvāsa* in *samāna-saṁvāsa-sīmā* where bhikkhus can live without parting from their three cīvaras, that is to say, those who live in that sīmā although their three cīvaras are not all with them, are not counted as living apart from their three cīvaras. He also allowed the sangha to announce for sick bhikkhus permission to live apart from their three cīvara. Beyond the permitted time and place, a bhikkhu who does not get permission must have the complete set of three cīvara. If he leaves certain cīvara such as *saṅghāṭi* at another place even for one night, when the dawn has come he is nissaggiya-pācittiya.

Hearing this much, it seems that we understand the Exalted Buddha's authorization when establishing this training-rule and this is really practicable, but then the question has arisen as to what extent the cīvara are kept and are not separated from the bhikkhu. Now therefore, we come to consider the boundary (khetta). The boundary does not mean the bhikkhu's body as understood in the past, for then, when the dawn had come, he would have to dress himself in all three robes, but it means the place in which a bhikkhu lives. A bhikkhu who lives in a *sīmā* which has been declared *ticīvara-avippāvāsa* is not separated from his cīvara (while he stays within the *sīmā*), and it is probable that almost all Wats at that time were within such a boundary. In Vibhaṅga therefore, it is explained as the boundary belonging to a village and the residences of bhikkhus were not mentioned at all.

The boundaries mentioned in the Vibhaṅga can be summarized thus: that belonging to one family, or to different families. The former is as follows: a house has things surrounding it—and those things surrounding it (such as trees, hedges, fences, etc.) are its boundary. If it is without such surrounding marks, then the house itself where the cloth is kept is the boundary. With a building established on the ground having surrounding marks, these become the boundary, while if it has none then the room where the cloths are kept becomes the boundary. In a boat, this is the same.



Fields, threshing-grounds and plantations having surroundings, the limits of those surroundings should be the boundary. If they have no surroundings, the limit is the *hatthapāsa* of one forearm between the body and the cloth.

The shade surrounding the tree-root at noon becomes the boundary (for a bhikkhu living under that tree).

A bhikkhu who keeps his *civara* in this boundary or lives within it, or does not go further from the boundary than *hatthapāsa*, is not separated from his *civara*.

In the case where any of these places belong to different families, the place of any one family with whom the bhikkhu keeps his *civara*, becomes the boundary. Or sometimes a public place becomes the boundary. If a bhikkhu is unable to distinguish the boundaries belonging to different places, his own *hatthapāsa* becomes the boundary.

In a forest without houses, seven *abbhantara* extending around a bhikkhu in all directions, are his boundary. One *abbhantara* is equal to 28 sork (approx 45 feet) or to 7 wah, (see Ch.X).

But in a *sattha*, a group of carts or a caravan belonging to one family, the area extending behind and in front of it for seven *abbhantara* and one *abbhantara* along the sides, becomes the boundary. I do not understand this matter. If it is held that the area mentioned above is an *upacāra* (surrounding area) of houses with surrounding things (to mark the boundary), then their area should be measured by *leṭṭhupāṭha* (the area marked out by throwing a ball of clay in all directions by a medium strong man) according to the method used to estimate the area of *upacāra* surrounding a house, which is explained elsewhere. Here the Commentator does not estimate in this way. Why should the caravan, which is not settled in one place, have a greater area than that of the house? But in a caravan belonging to different families, a bhikkhu should keep the *hatthapāsa* of the caravan as the boundary. It seems also that in a caravan belonging to one

family a bhikkhu should also have his *hatthapāsa* like this. In a caravan belonging to different families, the cart of whichever family he keeps his *civara*, that cart's *hatthapāsa* should be the boundary.

These areas have been estimated for those bhikkhus who were travelling together with (merchants), or it is probable that this tradition was in accordance with the custom of bhikkhus not living in one place but really I do not understand the opinion of the Vibhanga-arranger upon this matter.

At the present time, how should the boundary be estimated for those bhikkhus who live in wats in a populated area where the announcement of *ticivara-avippāvāsa* has not been made and for those who use many *atireka-civara* or *vikappita-civara* leading them to commit this *āpatti* more and more? Now the area-estimations are according to the preceeding statements, as follows: Where the *kuṭi* which only one bhikkhu occupies, has a surrounding space then the things surrounding it (fence, wall, trees) are the boundary. Where there is none the *kuṭi* itself is the boundary.

A *kuṭi* occupied by many bhikkhus having a surrounding space is itself the boundary for keeping *civara* but if the *kuṭi* has no surrounding space, then the room where *civara* are kept is the boundary.

A *Sālā* and other public places should be estimated according to whether one or many bhikkhus occupy it.

Where the root of a tree and an open space have something surrounding them, the boundary should be determined by those things. The root of a tree without surrounding marks should be determined by the shade of the tree at noon. An open space with no boundary should be limited by the *hatthapāsa* between a bhikkhu and his robes.

In short, the places where a bhikkhu keeps his *saṅghāṭi* when he is wearing only *antaravāsaka* and *uttarāsaṅga* entering the houses, should be understood as his boundary.



A *civara* which is *nissaggiya* because its owner lives apart from it, even for a night, should be forfeited to a *sangha*, to a *gana* or to an individual *bhikkhu*. The words of forfeiture to an individual are as follows:

IDAṂ ME BHANTE CĪVARAM RATTIVIPPAVUT-  
TAM AÑÑATRA BHIKKHUSAMMATIYĀ NISSAG-  
GIYAM, IMĀHAM ĀYASMATO NISSAJJĀMI.

Meaning: "This, my *civara*, venerable sir, being separated from me for a night without the consent of *bhikkhus* is to be forfeited, I forfeit it to you".

If this refers to two *civaras*, the word should be, *DVICĪVARAM*, and if to three, the word should be *TICĪVARAM*.

The words uttered when returning the *civara* should be understood as in the last rule.

A *bhikkhu* who uses a *civara* which is *nissaggiya*, not having forfeited it, is *dukkata*. A *civara* which has been forfeited and returned to the (former) owner can, if desired, be determined as one of the three-*civara*.

This training-rule is *acittaka*. Even though a *bhikkhu* does not intend but he already lives apart from his *civara*, yet he is *āpatti*. If during a day or night when a *bhikkhu* is living apart from his *civara*, he gives up (*paccuttthara*) that *civara*, or he has lost it, or it has been destroyed, or it no longer belongs to him, before the arising of dawn, then he is not *āpatti*.

### 3. The third *sikkhāpada* states :

(During a time) when (stored-up) cloth (made up into robes or not) is finished up and when the *kathina* (privileges) are in abeyance, should there accrue to a *bhikkhu* a cloth outside the time (appointed for robes), it can be accepted by the *bhikkhu* if he wishes. Having accepted it, he must get it made up as soon as possible. If it is not enough for at least one complete robe, the cloth

can be laid aside by that bhikkhu for a month at the most in the expectation of completing what is lacking. Should he lay it aside for longer than that, even in the expectation (of completing it), this entails expiation with forfeiture. (3)

A *civara* (meaning robe-material) which has accrued to a bhikkhu outside the *civara*-time (a month after the Rains) and outside the Kathina-privileges, is called *akālacivara*. This *akālacivara* is surely just an *atirekacivara* but if a bhikkhu wishes to make up one of his three *civara* which is lacking (or worn out) and when a bhikkhu has hope of gaining *civara*-material from other places, then he can keep that *akālacivara* (to be made) for a month at the most. If a bhikkhu does not wish to make it up or he has no more hope, then the life-span of that material is only ten days, as we said above. Or even if a bhikkhu has hope but it will take longer than one month, he cannot keep it longer than ten days. When a bhikkhu has already laid aside (or kept) an *akālacivara* and then new material accrues to him, sufficient to make up at least one of the three *civara*, the question then arises how to count the days remaining. This should be understood by comparing the age of material which has already been kept and the age of the new material recently accrued, and the bhikkhu should hurry to complete it within the 'lifespan' of whichever cloth has the least.

For example, a bhikkhu has kept cloth for fifteen days when new cloth accrues to him so that in this case the latter (being counted as *atireka-civara*) has only ten day's life, so he must hurry to complete it within this latter time. But suppose that he has kept the *akālacivara* already for 22 days and then new cloth accrues to him, in this case he should hurry to make it up according to the remaining age of the old cloth, that is, eight days. If he has kept the *akālacivara* already for more than ten days but not yet for a month and then new cloth accrues to him, the quality of which differs widely from the former, he can give up (the wish to complete it); or perhaps the new cloth has accrued to a bhikkhu nearly at the end of a month so that he cannot complete it in time,



then he should make an *adhittāna* that (both) should be other requisites (*parikkhāra*) or he should 'vikap' it, or should give it to others on the very day when he has decided not to make it up (into *civara*). The cloth which passes beyond the time-limits and is then nissaggiya should be forfeited to a sangha, to a *gaṇa* or to an individual bhikkhu. The words of forfeiture to an individual are as follows:

IDAṀ ME BHANTE AKĀLACĪVARAM MĀSĀTIK-  
KANTAM NISSAGGIYAM, IMĀHAM ĀYASMATO  
NISSAJJĀMI.

Meaning: "This, my *akālacīvāra*, venerable sir, passing beyond a month, is to be forfeited, I forfeit it to you".

A bhikkhu who uses a *civara* which is nissaggiya and has not been forfeited, is dukkaṭa.

The explanation of the remainder should be understood as stated in the first training-rule.

#### 4. The fourth sikkhāpada states:

Should any bhikkhu get an old robe washed or dyed or washed by beating by a bhikkhuni not related to him, this entails expiation with forfeiture. (4)

The 'old robe' means one used already, drawn on already, put on already, even if only once. In the Vibhaṅga it is said that when a bhikkhu has asked a bhikkhuni to do any of the actions mentioned above, it becomes the base of nissaggiya *pācittiya*. A bhikkhu has asked a bhikkhuni to do two, or even three, of these actions together, then the first action will be the base of nissaggiya *pācittiya* while the latter ones are the base of dukkaṭa. A bhikkhu who has asked a bhikkhuni to wash his sitting-cloth or bedding cloth, is dukkaṭa.

Since the term '*aññātikāya*' in this training-rule specifies the bhikkhuni who is not a relation, then a bhikkhu who asks one who is related to him is not *āpatti*. Due to the causative verbs used, if a bhikkhu does not ask a bhikkhuni but an unrelated

bhikkhuni manages it by herself, or helps a bhikkhuni who is related to that bhikkhu, as he has not asked her, he is not āpatti. Due to the term 'an old cīvara', a bhikkhu who asks a bhikkhuni to wash a cloth which has not been worn, is not āpatti. Due to the term 'cīvara' occurring in the sikkhāpada, if a bhikkhu asks bhikkhuni to wash things other than robes, he is not āpatti.

This sikkhāpada does not bring about any result now (because there are no bhikkhunis) but I have explained it at some length in order that students will be able to discern what is the meaning of the terms in the training-rule. Again, the aim of this training-rule is to prevent a bhikkhu from behaving in an ugly way. A bhikkhu who asks a woman leading the household life (to wash cīvara and so on) is not nissaggiya pācittiya, yet he does not escape from ugly behaviour. A bhikkhu who desires to practise in the right way should refrain from such conduct.

#### **5. The fifth sikkhāpada states:**

Should any bhikkhu accept a robe from the hand of a bhikkhuni not related to him, unless it is in exchange, this entails expiation with forfeiture. (5)

The phrase "unless it is in exchange" leads to the assumption that this training-rule has been laid down in order to prevent a bhikkhu from accepting things 'one-sidedly' (the bhikkhu giving nothing but only receiving) from a bhikkhuni of rather small means. If it is proper for a bhikkhu to accept it, he should give something in exchange and the exchanged thing can be either greater or lesser in value but I understand that it should be of equal value.

Āpatti in this training-rule comes to a head for a bhikkhu both by *doing* and by *not doing*; that is to say, a bhikkhu *accepts* a cīvara but he *does not give anything in exchange*.

#### **6. The sixth sikkhāpada states:**

Should any bhikkhu ask for a cloth (made up into robes or not) from a man or woman householder not related to him, unless it is on the (proper) occasion, this entails



expiation with forfeiture. Herein the (proper) occasion is this: the bhikkhu has had a robe stolen or has lost it. This is the (proper) occasion. (6)

The term "*aññātikam*" means one who is not related either through the mother's or the father's side through seven generations (three in the past -- to great-grandfather, etc.; and three to the future -- to great-grandson, etc.). Why are relatives (in the Vibhaṅga) counted through seven generations? I understand that the people counted here are able to be seen (by ourselves). One can see the past generations back at most to one's great-grandfather and forward at most to one's great-grandson. So counting oneself as the centre, the past three generations and the future three are seven altogether. People can thus see their relatives only within seven generations and we do not find (normally) examples of people who can see beyond this. If there were such people then those other generations seen may also be counted as relatives. Here the 'in-laws' are not counted as relatives. The occasions when a bhikkhu can ask for a *civara* from a householder who is not related to him, are two in number: he has had a *civara* stolen or snatched away; or has lost it or his *civara* has been destroyed so that it can no longer be used. When there is no such occasion, and a bhikkhu has asked a male or female householder not related to him, excepting those who have given *pavāraṇā* to him, which is allowed in another training-rule (see the following rule), he is *dukkata* when making efforts to ask, and *nissaggiya pācittiya* when he actually obtains the cloth. The words of forfeiture to an individual bhikkhu are as follows:

IDAṀ ME BHANTE CĪVARAṀ AÑÑĀTAKAṀ  
GAHAPATTIKAṀ AÑÑĀTRA SAMAYĀ VIÑÑĀPI-  
TAM NISSAGGIYAM, IMĀHAṀ ĀYASMATO  
NISSAJJĀMI.

which means: "This, my *civara*, venerable sir, having asked it from an unrelated householder, at other than the (proper) occasion, is to be forfeited; I forfeit it to you".

This āpatti is *acittaka*, therefore if he is not related, a bhikkhu *knowing* this matter or *being doubtful*, or (*mis*)-*understanding* that he *is* related, asking for it outside the occasion, in every case is nissaggiya, being called in short *tika-pācittiya* (three-action pācittiya). When a householder is related to the bhikkhu concerned but the latter understands that he is not, or doubts' and then asks, he is dukkata. If a householder is a bhikkhu's relative and that bhikkhu knows this and asks for a cīvara, he is not āpatti, because of the phrase in the training-rule, "one who is not related" so that a bhikkhu can ask for it from relatives. Because of the phrase "unless it is on the (proper) occasion" therefore a bhikkhu can ask on the (proper) occasion. Because there is permission in another training-rule, therefore a bhikkhu can ask those who have made him *pavāraṇā*. It is said in the Vibhaṅga that if a bhikkhu requests a cīvara for another, or gets it from his own resources, then he is not āpatti. Asking for another means that a bhikkhu asks for another bhikkhu whose cīvara is lost. Getting a cīvara from his own resources is not asking for it, therefore there will be no āpatti.

#### 7. The seventh sikkhāpada states:

Should a man or woman householder not related to that bhikkhu invite him to take as many cloths as he likes, (only) cloths amounting to at most an under-robe (*antaravāsaka*) and an upper-robe (*uttarāsaṅga*) together should be accepted therefrom by that bhikkhu. Should he accept more than that, it entails expiation with forfeiture. (7)

Due to the phrase '(only) cloths amounting at most to an under-robe and an upper-robe together should be accepted by that bhikkhu,' it is explained in Vibhaṅga that a bhikkhu whose three-cīvara have been lost should be pleased to take only two, and when two of his robes have been lost, he should accept only one and when he has lost only one, he should not accept at all. The term "pleased" (*santara*) here means to accept it with pleasure. On the ground that he is pleased to take beyond limitation, a



bhikkhu is dukkaṭa and when he obtains the cloth he is nissaggiya pācittiya. The words of forfeiture to an individual are as follows:

IDAM ME BHANTE CĪVARAM AÑÑĀTAKAM  
GAHAPATTIKAM TADUTTARIM VIÑÑĀPITAM  
NISSAGGIYAM, IMĀHAM ĀYASMATO NISSAJJĀMI

which means: "This, my cīvara, venerable sir, having been asked for beyond the limitation from an unrelated householder, is to be forfeited; I forfeit it to you".

The remaining explanation is the same as the previous training-rule, there being a difference concerning *anāpatti*. It is said in the Vibhaṅga, that if a bhikkhu carries many robes thinking that he would return the surplus cīvara and the owner verbally offers the surplus as well, in this case he does not give them because they have been snatched away or lost, and a bhikkhu accepting beyond limitation is not āpatti. This training-rule has been laid down so that a bhikkhu should know the limit. One who has accepted many cīvara is one who knows no limit and falls into fault. (On the other hand) a bhikkhu who does not accept (an offered cīvara) may cause the faith of a layman to decline, for by not receiving he may cause disappointment. The Vibhaṅga-arrangers lay stress on the last point after which they speak about *anāpatti* as mentioned above. This matter should be held as an example: that a bhikkhu should behave properly in accepting, not being so greedy that the donor feels weary, and should not so display his fewness of wishes that the donor is disappointed.

#### 8. The eighth sikkhāpada states:

(It may be that) a man or woman householder not related to a bhikkhu will purchase a cloth specifically for that bhikkhu (thinking), "With this purchase price for a cloth I shall purchase a cloth and supply the bhikkhu named so-and-so with a cloth". If that bhikkhu should then without being first invited go there and give instructions

about the cloth thus, "It would be very good if you sir, would purchase this or that kind of cloth with this purchase price for a cloth and supply me with that", (doing so) out of desire for a fine quality (cloth), this entails expiation with forfeiture. (8)

'One who has not made *pavāraṇā*' means one who is not related and who has not invited a bhikkhu to ask for a cīvara when he needs it. This will be explained in another training-rule below upon *pavāraṇā*. A bhikkhu knowing that (a householder) not related and not having made *pavāraṇā* will purchase a cīvara for him, who then goes asking him to purchase a finer and more expensive cīvara, when the householder has purchased it as instructed by him, then he is dukkaṭa for every effort made. When he obtains it he is nissaggiya pācittiya. The words of forfeiture to an individual are as follows:

IDAM ME BHANTE CĪVARAM PUBBE APPAVĀ-  
RITENA AÑÑĀTAKAM GAHAPATTIKAM UPASAM-  
KAMITVĀ CĪVARE VIKAPPAM ĀPANNAM NIS-  
SAGGIYAM, IMĀHAM ĀYASMATO NISSAJJĀMI

which means: "Having approached without prior *pavāraṇā* an unrelated householder and having given him instruction regarding the cīvara, this, my cīvara, is to be forfeited, I forfeit it to you".

Because of the phrase 'doing so out of desire for a fine-quality (robe)', it is explained in Vibhaṅga that if a householder desires to provide a very expensive cīvara but a bhikkhu then instructs him to purchase lower-priced cīvara, he is not āpatti.

The remaining explanation is the same as that in the sixth training-rule concerning asking for cīvara.

#### 9. The ninth sikkhāpada states:

(It may be that two or more) men or women householders not related to a bhikkhu individually will purchase individual cloths specifically for that bhikkhu (thinking), "With these purchase prices for individual cloths we shall



purchase individual cloths and supply the bhikkhu named so-and-so with individual cloths". If that bhikkhu should then without being first invited go there and give instructions about cloths thus, "It would be very good if you sirs, would purchase this or that kind of cloth with these purchase prices for individual cloths and supply me with that, both doing so with one" (i.e. together), (doing so) out of desire for a fine-quality cloth, this entails expiation with forfeiture. (9)

The subject of this training-rule is the same as that of the previous one except that each has individually prepared separate *civara* specifically for that bhikkhu, just as people approach a newly-ordained bhikkhu to make offerings.

A bhikkhu goes there and gives instruction for the joining of these purchase prices to purchase only one piece of cloth, or to lessen the piece of cloth but increasing its quality. But doing so, the householder need not increase the purchase-price so why is it not allowed to do this? It is understood that it is because they do not make *pavāraṇā* beforehand, so it is not suitable conduct for a bhikkhu.

#### 10. The tenth sikkhāpada states:

Should a king or a king's officer or a brahmin or a householder send the purchase price of a cloth by a messenger specifically for a bhikkhu (saying), "With this purchase price of a cloth purchase a cloth and supply the bhikkhu named so-and so with a cloth", and should the messenger approach that bhikkhu and say thus, "Venerable sir, this purchase price of a cloth has been brought specifically for the venerable one; let the venerable one accept the purchase price of a cloth", then the messenger should be told by the bhikkhu "Friend, we do not accept the purchase price of a cloth, but we accept a cloth (material) at the (proper) time and (of the kinds that are) allowable". (Now) should the messenger say to the bhikkhu thus "Has the venerable one a steward?", (then) bhikkhus, a monastery attendant or a lay follower can be indicated as

a steward by the bhikkhu if he needs a cloth (saying), "Friend, this is the bhikkhus' steward". If the messenger, after instructing the steward, should approach the bhikkhu and say thus, "Venerable sir, the steward indicated by the venerable one has been instructed by me; let the venerable one approach him for a cloth at the (proper) time and he will supply it (to you)", then the steward can be prompted and reminded two or three times by the bhikkhu if he needs a cloth (saying), "Friend, I have need of a cloth". If on being prompted and reminded two or three times the cloth is forthcoming, that is good; if it should not be forthcoming (the bhikkhu) can stand in silence for the purpose four times, five times or six times at most. If on standing in silence for that purpose four times, five times or six times at most the cloth is forthcoming, that is good; if it should not be forthcoming, and if on making further efforts, it is forthcoming, then it entails expiation with forfeiture. If it should not be forthcoming he should go himself or send a messenger to the place from which the purchase price of a cloth was brought (to say), "That purchase price of a cloth that you sirs, sent specifically for a bhikkhu has provided nothing at all for that bhikkhu; let those concerned send for what is theirs lest what is theirs be lost". This is the proper course here. (10)

The Vibhaṅga-arranger who had explained this training-rule in the Vibhaṅga has repeated it commenting only upon some explainable terms. I shall mention some of them. The word to indicate the steward (*veyyāvacca*) is simply mentioned by the bhikkhu and it is prohibited for (1) a bhikkhu to order the messenger to give the purchase-price to the steward; (2) a bhikkhu to promise to the messenger that the steward will keep the purchase price, or will exchange it for the *civara* and offer it to him.

Because of the words of reminder saying plainly, "I have need of cloth", the Vibhaṅga-arranger prohibits the bhikkhu



from saying, "Give it to me", "Bring it and give it to me", "Go to exchange it", or "Go to purchase it".

Due to the term 'stand in silence', the Vibhaṅga (-composer) suggests that he should not sit on a sitting-place and should not receive any offering, and should not teach any Dhamma. If he has been asked, "What business have you come upon?" - he should say, "You should know yourself". If a bhikkhu sits on the sitting-place, receives offerings or speaks Dhamma (to the steward) then his standing-time must be reduced accordingly. The method to count the reminding time and standing-time is as follows: two times of standing are equal to one time of reminding and it is allowed to vary these.

With reference to the sentence, "A bhikkhu should go himself or send a messenger..... This is the proper course here", the Commentator mentions that if a bhikkhu does not do this, he is dukkaṭa since he is *vattabheda*, that is has broken the duty proper to him (*vatta*).

According to my opinion, this matter should be determined by the right of the bhikkhu. The Vibhaṅga (-composer) prohibits bhikkhus from ordering the messenger to hand over the purchase-price to the steward thereby avoiding acceptance of the money through the steward. And again he prohibits a bhikkhu from promising that the steward will keep it for him and purchase (the robe) for him, for the same reason as above. Further, he prohibits a bhikkhu from reminding the steward directly and it is understood that the messenger does not thereby give to the bhikkhu the right over the purchase price. But by the messenger having approached to tell the bhikkhu it is understood that the right has been given to him already. But then if we try to put this in another way, it will be just juggling with words. Here the bhikkhu is prohibited from making further effort because, perhaps it is not suitable, it is not because the bhikkhu has no right for if he has no right for what purpose would the messenger approach and tell him?

The words for forfeiture to an individual are as follows:

IDAM ME BHANTE CĪVARAM ATIREKATIKKHATTUM  
 CODANĀYA ATIREKACHAKKHATTUM THĀNENA  
 ABHINIPPHĀDITAM NISSAGGIYAM, IMĀHAM ĀYAS-  
 MATO NISSAJJĀMI.

which means: "This my cīvara, venerable sir, being completed by more than three times of reminding and more than six times of standing is to be forfeited, I forfeit it to you".

When a bhikkhu has reminded him and stood to the full limit and has given it up and has not tried any more and then the steward has offered it by himself, or the owner of the purchase price has managed it, that bhikkhu is not āpatti.

## II. KOSIYA-VAGGA-the Section on Rugs, second.

### 1. The first sikkhāpada states:

Should any bhikkhu get a (felted) rug made mixed with silk this entails expiation with forfeiture. (11)

The *santhatam* is a piece of cloth. It is not woven but is stuck together, that is to say, at first bundles of goat's wool are spread and over this rice-liquid or other types of glue are poured so that the wool is stuck together to become a carpet. More goat's wool is then scattered and a roller is passed over it so that it becomes a thick or thin sheet just as the bhikkhu likes. This training-rule prohibits a bhikkhu who had made the so-called rug by mixing silk in it. Should he do this, he is nissaggiya. A bhikkhu makes by himself or requests another to do this for him from the beginning to the end, or he has half-finished and later requests another to finish it, or the reverse: he is nissaggiya in all these cases. In short, it is called the fourfold forfeiture, *catukka-nissaggiya-pācittiya*. A bhikkhu uses a rug like this made by another: he is dukkaṭa. If he uses it as a pillow-covering or mattress-covering, he is not āpatti. It should be understood that the purpose of this training-rule is to prevent bhikkhus



killing by boiling silkworms (for their silk) but the words forbidding this sort of rug refer only to the *santhatam*, therefore the Vibhaṅga-composer says: used in other ways he is not āpatti. With reference to this case, the Vibhaṅga (-composer) mentions dukkaṭa as a minor offence in some places here. I assume that even though a bhikkhu uses this rug in one of the other ways, yet he is not free from blame, so he should confess a dukkaṭa. It is probable that this kind of rug was used also by the public so that the bhikkhu would not have been accused of āpatti. So the Vibhaṅga-composer explains that he is not āpatti. A proper explanation should be made as follows: A bhikkhu makes it himself or requests another to make it for him for use in one of the other ways, for a seat, he is dukkaṭa; if he uses one made by another (person), he is not āpatti.

## 2. The second sikkhāpada states:

Should any bhikkhu get a (felted) rug made of pure black goat's wool, this entails expiation with forfeiture. (12)

## 3. The third sikkhāpada states:

When a bhikkhu is getting a new (felted) rug made, two parts of pure black goat's wool and the third of white and the fourth of ruddy brown must be incorporated. Should a bhikkhu get a new rug made without incorporating two parts of pure black goat's wool and the third of white and the fourth of ruddy brown, this entails expiation with forfeiture. (13)

The aim of this sikkhāpada is to prevent a bhikkhu using black goat's wool of more than two parts in four, or one half. It does not prohibit a bhikkhu from using white or ruddy goats-wool, either more than one part in four or as all of it. The reason why the black goat's wool should not be used is not understood by me.\* In the original story it is said that having such a rug was 'like householders'. Perhaps it was a kind of colour disliked by bhikkhus, as in the *Chalābhijāti* (the six classes of men) where the cruel, blackhearted man is described as being of black colour.

\* It may be that pure black goatswool was considered a special luxury and therefore not suitable. (Translators' note).

#### 4. The fourth sikkhāpada states:

When a bhikkhu has got a new (felted) rug made it must last him for six years. If without permission of bhikkhus a bhikkhu should get another new rug made within six years, whether the former one has been abandoned (worn out) meanwhile or not, this entails expiation with forfeiture. (14)

In Pāli idiom, one year is 'one rains'. The limitation of six years for using a *santhata* before changing it, is a short time. To use it longer than that is not prohibited. There is an exception for the bhikkhu who gains the permission of bhikkhus. It is narrated in the original incident that Lord Buddha mentioned the case of one bhikkhu who was ill. His relatives wanted him to go to stay with them to be cured. He could not take his *santhata* with him and without it he was not happy. This story is very difficult to understand. To clarify this story, it is said that if a bhikkhu has lost his old *santhata* he should certainly be permitted to make a new one.

#### 5. The fifth sikkhāpada states:

When a bhikkhu getting a sitting-rug made a (round or square piece) of a used rug one sugata-span round must be incorporated in order to make it unsightly. Should a bhikkhu get a new sitting-rug made without incorporating a (piece) of a used rug one sugata-span round, this entails expiation with forfeiture. (15)

Only in this one place is there a term for 'sitting'. The Composer explains in the Vibhaṅga that the *santhata* has a border but he does not explain clearly. With reference to the phrase 'made of a used rug one sugata-span round'—he explained that it was either round or square. The old rug means a used *santhata*. Why is it explained in the Vibhaṅga "worn below already, worn above already, even if only once"? This explanation probably is a confusion with (the sikkhāpada of the previous



vagga upon) old *civara*. A bhikkhu is not *āpatti* in the following cases, should he take one *sugata*-span all round of a used rug to spread it on just one corner of the new one, or he takes the old one, tears it up and mixes with it new goats-wool. If an old *santhata* is not available and a bhikkhu mixes it a little or not at all or gets one made by others and uses it, he will not be *āpatti*.

(See the comment or this training-rule in the Preface).

#### 6. The sixth sikkhāpada states:

Should goat's wool become available to a bhikkhu while he is travelling on a journey it can be accepted by him if he wishes; after it has been accepted, it can be carried (by him) by hand for three leagues at most if there is no one to carry (it for him); if he should carry it further than that while there is still no one to carry (it for him), this entails expiation with forfeiture. (16)

The *yojana* in Siam is equal to 400 *sen*. How it is measured elsewhere will be given in the last chapter on measurements. Woven goats-wool cloth is not included here. If a bhikkhu stops on the way for a certain time (within the three *yojana*), he can then continue to carry it.

#### 7. The seventh sikkhāpada states:

Should any bhikkhu get goat's wool washed or dyed or carded by a bhikkhuni not related to him, this entails expiation with forfeiture. (17)

All explanation should be understood as in the fourth training-rule of the *Civara-vagga* concerning the old *civara*.

#### 8. The eighth sikkhāpada states:

Should any bhikkhu receive, or cause to be received, or be glad at the money (gold, silver, bullion, money kept for him), this entails expiation with forfeiture. (18)

The term '*jātarūparajata*' refers firstly to personal adornments (of gold and silver), secondly to ingots, thirdly to '*rūpiya*' that is, commodities for buying and selling and refers not only to gold and silver but to anything which can be used in this way. All the abovementioned things are included in this term. The phrase, 'be glad at the money kept for him,' suggests that if it is only *cittupapāda* (the arising of a mental state), he would not be *āpatti*, so it must refer to the action of receiving it and to holding the right over it.

The forfeitable *jātarūparajata* should be forfeited in the midst of a sangha. The forfeiture words are:

AHAM BHANTE RŪPIYAM PAṬIGGAHESIM,  
IDAM ME NISSAGGIYAM, IMĀHAM SAṄGHASSA  
NISSAJJĀMI.

with the meaning of: "I have accepted the *rūpiya* which is to be forfeited, I forfeit it to the sangha". How should the sangha subsequently treat the forfeited money? It is taught that the sangha should give it to any *upāsaka* who should happen to go there. If he does not desire to take it, he should be asked to throw it away. If he does not accept the sangha's request, a bhikkhu should be nominated as 'one who throws away' having five qualities: not being overpowered by the four biases (*āgati*) and be one who knows how it is truly thrown, or not thrown away. Such a bhikkhu should throw it away not noting where the forfeited money has fallen down. If he keeps the place of its falling in mind he is *dukkata*.

*Āpatti* in this training-rule is *acittaka*. It seems to me that it was strictly prohibited in the early times but later there was Lord Buddha's allowance for leniency in other places, for instance, if the householder passes *rūpiya* to the hands of a *kappiyakāraka*, (one who makes things allowable) saying, 'Please provide suitable things for a bhikkhu'. In this case Lord Buddha allows the bhikkhu to be glad at whatever suitable thing has been obtained from such *rūpiya*. But He prohibits a bhikkhu from being gladdened



by that very *rūpiya*. But then this is not much different from the phrase, "UPANIKKITAM VĀ SĀDIYEYYA," to be glad at the money kept for him. It is only said, 'He should not grasp the power (or right) over the *jāta-rūpa-rajata*, but over whatever is suitable having been got from the *jāta-rūpa-rajata*'. This case came into existence from the millionaire Menḍaka since Lord Buddha first allowed him to offer such suitable things, this being called the 'Menḍaka-allowance' (*meṇḍakānuyāta*).

#### 9. The ninth sikkhāpada states:

Should any bhikkhu engage in the various kinds of trafficking with money, this entails expiation with forfeiture. (19)

*Rūpiya* here refers to gold, money or other materials which are generally accepted as the standards of exchange. To engage in various kinds of trafficking with money means to buy various kinds of requisites with *rūpiya*, to pay the labourer's wages, or to pay for something else. The benefit of this training-rule is to prevent a bhikkhu from using the forfeited *rūpa-rajata*, mentioned in the previous training-rule for buying requisites or for paying labourer's wages. This is my own explanation, while the Dhamma-arranging Ācariya has explained in another way: *jāta-rūpa-rajata* which are in the form of ornaments or ingots should have been explained in the last training-rule but are explained here instead and "trafficking with money" is explained by the Ācariya in this way: that a bhikkhu exchanges ornaments with ornaments, the ingot with the ingot, or else some kind of mixed exchange, ingot with ornament. I understand that a bhikkhu who has done so is forbidden by the last training-rule. The meaning of this training-rule should not be a repetition of the last one. The forfeitable materials in this training-rule should be forfeited amidst the Sangha as in the last training-rule. The forfeiture words are as follows:

AHAM BHANTE NĀNAPPAKĀRAKAM RŪPIYA-  
SAMVOHĀRAM SAMĀPAJJIM IDAM ME NISSAG-  
GIYAM, IMĀHAM SAṄGHASSA NISSAJJĀMI.

Meaning: "I have engaged in various kinds of trafficking with *rūpiya* and this of mine is to be forfeited. I forfeit it to the Sangha". Since the labourers' wages cannot be forfeited, a bhikkhu should only confess the āpatti.

#### 10. The tenth sikkhāpada states:

Should any bhikkhu engage in the various kinds of buying and selling, this entails expiation with forfeiture. (20)

Buying and selling in this case refers to exchange, or to acceptance of the suitable things with other suitable things, as for instance in the transaction between the farmer changing grain rice for whatever he needs, since buying and selling with *rūpiya* have been forbidden by the last two training-rules. Bearing this in mind, the exchange of material which is not counted as barter, called in Māgadhi '*pārivattakam*', (as changing robes etc.) is also included in this training-rule. Because it is allowed clearly by Lord Buddha for fellow Dhamma-practicers (that is bhikkhus and sāmaneras) to exchange, this training-rule therefore refers only to forbidding exchange with householders. It is suggested that the thing to be forfeited in this training-rule is to be forfeited to a sangha, a group (of bhikkhus) or to an individual. The words of forfeiture to an individual are as follows:

AHAM BHANTE NĀNAPPAKĀRAKAM KAYAVIK-  
KAYAM SAMĀPAJJIM, IDAM ME NISSAGGIYAM,  
IMĀHAM ĀYASMATO NISSAJJĀMI.

which means: "I have engaged in various kinds of buying and selling, this of mine is forfeited. I forfeit it to you".

If a bhikkhu enquires the price of a thing from the (shop) owner and informs his steward of his need, he is not āpatti.

### III. PATTA-VAGGA the Section on Bowls, third.

#### 1. The first sikkhāpada states:

An extra bowl can be kept for ten days at most. If that is exceeded, it entails expiation with forfeiture. (21)



The bowl, which may be made of clay or of iron and which may differ in size, being small, middling or large, as explained in other places, is allowed by Lord Buddha as a requisite of bhikkhus and a bhikkhu is allowed by Him to own only one. The bowl determined by a bhikkhu to be his requisite is called by him his determined bowl (*adhiṭṭhāna-patta*). Beyond that, a second bowl and so on, is called an 'extra bowl' (*atireka-patta*). The so-called extra-bowl is only allowed by Lord Buddha to be kept at most for ten days, unlike cīvara which can be kept in some cases, beyond ten days. If a bhikkhu keeps his extra-bowl beyond ten days, he is nissaggiya-pācittiya.

The forfeiture-words to an individual (bhikkhu) are as follows:

AYAM ME BHANTE PATTO DASĀHĀTIKKANTO  
NISSAGGIYO, IMĀHAM AYASMATO NISSAJJĀMI.

Meaning: "This, my bowl, being kept beyond ten days is to be forfeited, I forfeit it to you".

The words for returning it are:

IMAM PATTAM AYASMATO DAMMI,

which means: "I give you this bowl". A bhikkhu who, while knowing that his extra-bowl must be forfeited, continues to use it, is dukkaṭa. Lord Buddha allows a bhikkhu to 'vikap' a bowl in the same way as a robe. The rest of the explanation should be understood as that given in the training-rule dealing with extra robes.

## 2. The second sikkhāpada states:

Should any bhikkhu change a bowl with less than five mends for a new bowl, this entails expiation with forfeiture. That (new) bowl must be forfeited by that bhikkhu to a gathering of bhikkhus. The bowl last given up by the gathering of bhikkhus must be given to that

bhikkhu (with the words), "Bhikkhu, this is your bowl and it must be kept until it is broken". This is the proper course here. (22)

The crack longer than two fingerbreadths is counted as one mend of that bowl. When its length is less than this, it is not counted. In the Vibhaṅga, the term '*cetāpeyya*' is explained as 'request'. It is suggested that the bowl which is to be forfeited in this training-rule should be forfeited in the presence of the sangha. Then the sangha should announce a certain bhikkhu who is not overwhelmed by prejudice and who knows how to deal with this matter, to be the 'bowl-exchanger'. That bhikkhu should bring that new bowl to offer to the most senior thera, take his bowl to offer to the second most senior, and so on to the third, the fourth down to the newest bhikkhu in that sangha. Taking that newest bhikkhu's bowl, he hands it to that bhikkhu to be used by him. There are words which prohibit a bhikkhu from determining a bad bowl hoping to get a better one through this procedure. A bhikkhu who does so is dukkata.

It seems as though this bowl-exchange will bring benefit to everybody from the most senior to the newcomer but in fact by this procedure, that group of bhikkhus are all involved in the fault of the bhikkhu who is nissaggiya-pācittiya. This does not appear just enough and there must be some reason underlying this procedure but at the present I have not been able to see it. May experts in the Vinaya ponder over this matter in the future.

### 3. The third sikkhāpada states:

There are medicines for sick bhikkhus to take, namely, ghee, fresh butter, oil, honey, molasses. After these have been accepted, they can be kept in store and used for seven days at most. If that is exceeded, it entails expiation with forfeiture. (23)



In the Vibhaṅga, the five medicines are explained thus: ghee (clarified butter) and fresh butter are made of either cows', goats' or buffaloes' milk, or from any animal's milk the flesh of which is allowable to bhikkhus. Oil is derived from sesamun, mustard, madhuka-kernels (*Bassia latifolia*), castor oil fruits or fat from the flesh of animals. Honey is the sweet liquid accumulated by bees. Molasses is the sweet liquid pressed out from sugar-canes.

Due to the explanation of the last medicine, some Theras object to the sweet liquid derived from the sugar-palm. They prefer a literal interpretation of this matter and do not concentrate on its meaning. My opinion is that the sweet liquid derived from sugar-cane, from sugar palms or from other sources can equally well be used. These other sources of sugar should not be objected to by them. Common people (in Siam) also understand this matter calling all sorts of sweet liquids (and sugar-solids) 'palm water' (literally). The reason for calling all these by this name is that first they discovered and used the sugar from the sugar-palm. [Perhaps the sugarcane is not indigenous to this part of the world]. Later, they discovered that 'palm-water' can be got from the coconut-palm, from sugar-cane or from other sources, yet they still called them all 'palm-water' (after the name of the sugar-palm in Thai), concentrating on the meaning rather than on literal accuracy. The explanation of the term '*phāṇita*' in the Vibhaṅga is: the sweet liquid derived from sugar-cane or briefly sugar-cane juice. In that place (India) the case was the same where the people first discovered sugar from *phāṇita* and then used this word for all sorts of sugars which were discovered later. One more example of this is that Magadha people first found oil derived from the sesamum seed called '*tilam*' so they named the oil '*telam*' meaning what is derived from sesamum seeds. Later, they found that oil can be derived from other seeds or from animal-fat but still they used the word '*telam*' for it. If some Theras understand that sweet juice is derived from sugar-cane only, then it is better that they should not use any at all for how can they know that the sugar of the present time is derived from sugar-cane only?

Regarding the question of why the medicine mentioned above was allowed by Lord Buddha to be used for seven days at most, I understand that this is to prevent those things from rotting, becoming rancid or sour. In any case, a bhikkhu who has kept them beyond seven days is nissaggiya. The words of forfeiture to an individual are:

IDAṂ ME BHANTE BHESAJJAM SATTĀHĀTIK-  
KANTAM NISSAGGIYAM, IMĀHAM ĀYASMATO  
NISSAJJĀMI.

which means: "This, my medicine, has been kept beyond seven days and is to be forfeited. I forfeit it to you". The words for returning it are:

IMAM BHESAJJAM ĀYASMATO DAMMI.

meaning: "I give this medicine to you". It is advised that the medicine which has been returned after forfeiture, should not be consumed either by the forfeiting bhikkhu or by other bhikkhus. It should be utilized in other ways such as fuel for lamps or be mixed with colours. It is allowed (for oil) to be used by other bhikkhus for massage of their bodies. A bhikkhu who has decided that he will not use a medicine at the time of receiving it, is not āpatti although he keeps it beyond seven days. It is well to remember that in case it is lost, or the bhikkhu loses his right over it within seven days, then in either case it is no longer medicine and cannot be the base of āpatti. It is said that if a bhikkhu gives it to one who has not the *upasampadā*, and who then returns it, he can consume it again. If medicine has been kept beyond seven days, other bhikkhus should not consume it. Probably it is also not proper but they should not be called nissaggiya.

#### 4. The fourth sikkhāpada states:

Rains-cloth (or material) can be sought by a bhikkhu reckoning that the Remainder of the Hot Season is the



(whole last) month (of that season) and it can be worn (by him reckoning that) the Remainder of the Hot Season is the (last) fortnight (of that season). If he should seek rains-cloth (or material) reckoning that the Remainder of the Hot Season (starts) earlier than the (last month) (of that season) and should wear it (reckoning that) the Rest of the Hot Season (starts) earlier than the (last) fortnight (of that season), this entails expiation with forfeiture. (24)

The rains-cloth is allowed by Lord Buddha as an extra and temporary requisite. A bhikkhu can determine it for use within the four months of the Rains. Beyond that, there is the tradition to 'vikap' it. In this training-rule Lord Buddha allows bhikkhus to seek for it one month before the Rains, that is from the first day of the waning moon in the seventh month (*Jetṭhamāsa*) to the 15th day of the eighth month (*Āsāḷhamāsa*), and having made it, they can wear it a fortnight before the Rains, that is, from the first day of the waxing moon of *Āsāḷha* to the fifteenth. The phrase, "Lord Buddha allows them to seek it" suggests that some special privilege should be given to them, such as they can ask directly for it and can keep it longer than the ordinary extra-robe. But to ask for it directly is prohibited in the Vibhaṅga, and in the latter it is allowed for a bhikkhu to say only, 'Now the time of Rains-cloth has come' but the composer does not mention what state it will have (as extra-robe etc). The phrase "Lord Buddha allows them to make and wear it" suggests the same privilege, that is the determining of it earlier than the Rains but unfortunately, the composer does not explain it.

The āpatti comes to a bhikkhu in this training-rule because he utilizes the specially-allowed privileges before the time allowed for them by Lord Buddha. It was seen perhaps that bhikkhus began to search for this cloth earlier than the time allowed. There is a point here to be examined, that is, if a bhikkhu seeks it earlier than the time allowed but he asks for it from his relatives, asking

from whom is not *viññatti* (asking from people who are not relatives), then is that cloth to be treated as an Extra-robe? Or does he only want it as a Rains-cloth in which case, he is nissaggiya because he seeks it earlier than the allowable time and it cannot be treated under the heading of Extra-robe? If like this, then no one will be so foolish as to commit the āpatti in this training-rule. However, a bhikkhu can exempt himself from āpatti by saying, that he accepts it as an Extra-robe. Moreover, if a bhikkhu having made it, wears it earlier than the time allowed then how should it be treated differently from wearing an extra-robe? I wish to understand that the phrase, "to seek earlier than the time allowed" means asking for it from householders who are not relatives and who have not given an invitation (*pavāraṇā*). Even though a bhikkhu asks for it as an extra-robe, yet he is nissaggiya according to the training-rules dealing with asking for robes. The phrase, "to make and wear it" means, to determine it for use as Rains-cloth. If a bhikkhu seeks it in the presence of relatives and those who have made invitation—who are not included in the offence of *viññatti*, and wears it without determining it, he does not commit an offence under this training-rule because the robe given to him requires treatment under the heading of 'extra-robe'.

The meaning of this training-rule suggests that the āpatti is *sacittaka* but in the Vibhaṅga the Composer explains *acittaka* and I agree with his explanation. Suppose that though the time has not come, a bhikkhu understands that it has come already because of his wrong calculation, so he asks for rains-cloth in the presence of householders who are not relatives and have not made invitation, then it is impossible for him to be exempted from āpatti. I understand that the meaning of this training-rule does not lay stress on his miscalculation for it is held that everyone knows how to calculate the time. It is possible that the wrong calculation of time with regard to the time-limit might take place, therefore we should understand according to the Composer's words that āpatti in this training-rule is *acittaka*.



## 5. The fifth sikkhāpada states :

Should any bhikkhu give his own robe to a bhikkhu and (subsequently) being angry and displeased, take it away or get it taken away (from him), this entails expiation with forfeiture. (25)

A bhikkhu who has taken back his old robe commits *nissaggiya* only because he had done this with '*sakkasaññā*'—the conception that the robe belonged to him. He does not commit *avahāra* (stealing) because the Composer has accepted the privilege of the former owner over that robe. The original story of this training-rule clearly points this out : a certain bhikkhu gives his own robe to another bhikkhu after requesting him to do something but the receiver changes his mind and does not do what he has been asked to do. A bhikkhu who has given away his old robe should enjoy a profitable result but to take it away is improper behaviour.

This training-rule is confined to robes but to take away other requisites is also improper behaviour and a bhikkhu doing this is *dukkata*. Since this training-rule speaks about one bhikkhu's action to another, to take away things from one who has not the *upasampadā*, is improper too. A bhikkhu who does so is *dukkata*. The first bhikkhu is not *āpatti* in the case when a receiver returns it voluntarily to him, or else he takes it back through *vissāsa* (trust in friendship or by request). In the case of returning it voluntarily, it should be understood that the receiver accepts the robe with the idea that he will do something for the giver. Later, failing to carry out his aim, he returns it voluntarily to the former owner who is not *āpatti* by accepting it. In a case where the former owner takes it back through trust in friendship, it should be understood that he is not displeased or angry but realizes that the receiver does not want to use it and therefore requests the latter to return it. In this case the former owner is not *āpatti*.

#### **6. The sixth sikkhāpada states :**

Should any bhikkhu after asking by himself for thread get weavers to weave it into cloth, this entails expiation with forfeiture. (26)

The term "asking for" in this case refers to requests in the presence of householders who are not relatives and have not made invitation. To ask for the cloth which has been woven already is prohibited by the training-rule dealing with asking for robes, while to ask for thread and to get weavers to weave it into a robe is prohibited by this training-rule.

#### **7. The seventh sikkhāpada states :**

Should a man or woman householder not related to a bhikkhu get cloth woven by weavers specifically for him, then if that bhikkhu should without being first invited go there to the weavers and give instructions about the cloth thus "Friend, this cloth is being woven specifically for me. Make it long and wide and stout and the woof well set and the warp well stretched and well fulled and well brushed; then perhaps we might give those concerned some little present", and if after having spoken thus he should give some little present, even a little alms-food, this entails expiation with forfeiture. (27)

The explanation of this training-rule should be understood in the same way as the eighth training-rule of *Cīvaravagga*.

#### **8. The eighth sikkhāpada states :**

Should a cloth (be offered) in hot haste for a bhikkhu during the last ten days before the Kattika full moon (at the end) of the three months (of the First Rains Residence) it can be accepted by that bhikkhu provided he is aware that it is one (offered) in hot haste. Having accepted it, he can put it aside until the time for cloths



(that is, the last month of the Rains, or, if the Kathina has been spread, for the following four months as well, provided that the Kathina privileges are not suspended). If he should put it aside for longer than that, it entails expiation with forfeiture. (28)

There are two *Kattika* months, the first being the month of the 11th (*Assayuja*) Full Moon which is *Pavāraṇā* completing the three months of the Rains; and the second *Kattika* which is called the Full Moon of the complete four months of the Rains, or the Full Moon Day when the White Water Lilies (*Kumuda*) blossom, or just the Full Moon of *Kattika*-month falling on the Full Moon of the twelfth month (*Kattika*). The beginning of the last ten days before the Full Moon Day of *Kattika* completing three months falls on the sixth day of the eleventh month. After that Full Moon Day, the robe-time (*cīvarakāla*) has arrived when donors offer the cloth called '*vassāvāsikā*' to the bhikkhus who have completed the Rains Residence and it is time for a bhikkhu to change his robe. The Master has allowed many advantages (for such bhikkhus), for example, to keep an extra-robe for more than ten days, to travel without the triple robe complete for one whole month until the Full Moon of the last *Kattika*. If a bhikkhu has participated in Kathina during that month, the advantages extend through the four months of the Winter Season.

During the last ten days (before the *Kattika* Full Moon), if some donors offer a *vassāvāsikā* cloth hurriedly saying that they have urgent matters such as: they will be recruited into the army, or they must absent themselves for some business, or they become ill, or a pregnant woman is not sure of her life, so they have faith arising newly, and so on. Such kinds of robes are called *acceka-cīvara* which means a 'hot-haste robe'. Lord Buddha allowed bhikkhus to accept it before completing the Rains-residence according to this training-rule and allowed them to be put aside from the time of acceptance to the end of the robe-time.

This leads to the assumption that Lord Buddha allowed special benefits for the bhikkhus who observed the Rains Residence and who have still ten days before the completion of the three months but in the *Vassupannāyika Khandhaka* only one week is fixed. During these seven days before the completion of the Rains-residence, a bhikkhu who has necessary business may go and need not return within seven days. In this training-rule, ten days are fixed as the 'the age' of an extra-robe. When the robe-time comes, he need not 'vikap' (that 'hot-haste-robe'). He is nissaggiya when he has kept the robe beyond the time allowed.

#### 9. The ninth sikkhāpada states:

When at the Kattika Full Moon a bhikkhu has completed the Rains (season) living in such abodes as are forest abodes reputed to be dangerous and risky (on account of robbers etc), he can if he wishes deposit one of his three robes in a house. If there is some reason for that bhikkhu to live apart from that robe he can live apart from it for six nights at the most. If he should live apart from it for longer than that without permission of bhikkhus, it entails expiation with forfeiture. (29)

The Pāli of this training-rule is hard to understand. If I elaborate this too much then I am afraid of obscurity. However, I shall explain as much as I understand. A certain bhikkhu who lives only in forest abodes which are reputed to be dangerous and risky, from the beginning of the Rains (season) to the end four months later, if he has reasons and he wishes live apart from any of the three robes, he can deposit any one of them in a house, but he can live apart from it for six nights at the most. According to this, a bhikkhu who has completed his Rains-residence, is allowed to live apart from his robe only six days extending from the end of robe-time. I cannot be sure that my understanding is correct. Let the Vinaya-experts consider this matter in future. What I have done is to point out that which should be pondered: the term '*upavassam*', and the sentence: "*siyā ca tassa...*"



*vippavāsāya*" (meaning: if there is some reason for that bhikkhu to live apart from that robe....) from the foregoing (material which is separated in the training-rule).

It is said in the Vibhaṅga about forest abodes in this way: "It is at least 500 bows-length away (1 bows-length being equal to 4 sork or 1 wah, see the last chapter on Measurements) measured by the usual path used to go there and not as the crow flies". According the measurement given above, an abode which is at least 25 sen, from the houses of people is called a 'forest abode'. Such forest places are reputed to be dangerous and risky because the gangs of robbers and others who dwelt there and because people were often killed, assaulted and plundered there. A bhikkhu who lives in such forest abodes is given the special privilege to live apart from any of his robes for up to six nights according to Lord Buddha's allowance in this training-rule.

#### 10. The tenth sikkhāpada states :

Should any bhikkhu knowingly cause to be given to himself any gift (lit, 'gain', such as cloths, etc), which was to be given to the Sangha, this entails expiation with forfeiture. (30)

"Gains" here refer to robes, almsfood, abodes and medicines which are collectively called the Four Supports (*catupaccaya*) and other allowable things. The phrase "*saṅghikaṃ lābhaṃ parinātaṃ*" means gifts which are dedicated as offerings to the Sangha but not yet offered. A bhikkhu diverts such gifts to himself by asking for them directly, or by roundabout speech so that the donor will give to him. In either case he is dukkaṭa in making an effort and when he receives those gifts he is nissaggiya. The words of forfeiture to an individual are thus:

IDAM ME BHANTE JĀNAM SANGHIKAM LĀBHAM  
PARINATAM ATTANO PARINĀMITAM NISSAG-  
GIYAM, IMĀHAM ĀYASMATO NISSAJJĀMI,—  
which means: "This gift which was prepared as an offering to the Sangha, has been knowingly diverted by me and should be forfeited. I forfeit it to you".

A bhikkhu who has diverted a gift which was prepared as offering to a Sangha, to another Sangha, or to a cetiya, is dukkaṭa. A bhikkhu who has diverted such a gift to an individual should be dukkaṭa also but a pācittiya is laid down for this offence in another training-rule. In the Vibhanga it is added that a bhikkhu who diverts gifts intended for a cetiya with those for individuals and vice versa is dukkaṭa.

Because of the term "knowingly" the āpatti of this training-rule is *sacittaka*. According to the training-rules where the offence is *sacittaka*, a bhikkhu who does not know for certain but is doubtful, is dukkaṭa when he has done this already. There is no āpatti for a bhikkhu who has done this unknowingly. Especially here, a bhikkhu who gives advice to the donor who asks for it, is not āpatti.

### Summary of the Bases for Nissaggiya.

The subjects of Nissaggiya among the thirty training-rules can be classified into three groups:

- 1) nissaggiya by material,
- 2) nissaggiya by the bhikkhus' conduct, and
- 3) nissaggiya by being beyond time-limits.

#### 1. Nissaggiya by material.

Gold and silver; allowable things purchased with money; rugs (of felt) mixed with silk; rugs (of felt) made of pure black goats' wool; and rugs made of black goat's wool beyond the allowable part.

#### 2. Nissaggiya by the bhikkhus' conduct.

##### a) According to manner of receiving,

A robe which is accepted from the hand of a bhikkhuni who is not a relative;

A robe which is asked from householders who are not relatives and have not made invitation (*pavāraṇā*);



- Robes which are asked for beyond the allowable number when it is time to ask for them;
- A better robe asked for than that intended to be given by the donors;
- One good-quality robe asked for instead of two others intended to be given by donors;
- A robe asked for beyond the allowable number of times for standing and asking;
- Things obtained by barter with a householder;
- Almsbowls not asked for at the proper time;
- A robe taken away when given to another bhikkhu;
- Thread asked for to get robes woven;
- A robe which weavers have been asked to weave better than that intended by the donor;
- Gifts which are intended for Sangha but diverted to himself.

b) *According to a bhikkhu's actions.*

- Asking a bhikkhuni who is not a relative to wash, dye or beat a robe;
- Making a new rug when the old one has been used by a bhikkhu for less than six years;
- Making a new rug without incorporating parts of the used one;

c) *According to going beyond the allowed limits.*

- Wool brought beyond 3 yojanas;
- Rains-cloth sought and made earlier than the times allowed.

3. **Nissaggiya by being beyond the allowed time.**

- Living apart from his three robes even for a single night;
- Keeping an extra robe beyond ten days;
- Keeping an extra almsbowl beyond ten days;
- Keeping a 'beyond-the-time-robe' beyond one month;
- Keeping a 'hot-haste-robe' beyond the robe-time;
- Living apart from one's robe beyond six nights when a bhikkhu has special privileges;
- Keeping medicines beyond seven days.

### Practical Treatment for Nissaggiya.

It is suggested ( by the Commentator ) that things which are nissaggiya, except gold and silver (including money), the allowable things purchased by money, the new almsbowl obtained by asking by a bhikkhu not at the proper time, can be forfeited to the sangha only, while other things can be forfeited to the sangha, or to a *gana*, or to individuals. It seems to me that no one will face the difficulties of forfeiting nissaggiya things to a sangha, or to a *gana*, rather than to an individual. No one wishes to choose the more difficult method, so the words given above seem to be useless. If the words given above are without use, there should be a classification as to which things should be forfeited to a sangha and which to an individual, not to speak of the *gana* because in some wats there are not enough bhikkhus to form a sangha. Two or three bhikkhus form a *gana* and in this case, as the forfeiture to a sangha is impossible, the *gana* is the substitute. Moreover, there is a tradition for the receivers to return the forfeited things to the former owner, except in the case of the three subjects mentioned above and it is not said clearly regarding the things returned, which of them can be used by him and which cannot, except in the case of medicine kept beyond seven days. We should note it is said in some places that a bhikkhu who uses a robe which is already nissaggiya, but has not forfeited it, is dukkata, but in other places the composer does not mention this. In the case where the composer suggested that the sangha, gana or individual must return the nissaggiya things to the former owner, then can he use them? According to the tradition practised by bhikkhus the following items when forfeited and returned to the former owner can be used by him: the three robes being parted from a bhikkhu for one night, an extra robe, or extra almsbowl being kept beyond ten days. In the case of the three robes when returned after nissaggiya, a bhikkhu must re-determine them for use, while in case of an extra robe or almsbowl the time-limit begins again from the day of their return.



I understand that things which are nissaggiya according to the *first group* above (by material) become unsuitable for the first owner to use again and should not be returned to him because if they are returned, they cannot be used by him therefore returning them is useless. Things which are nissaggiya according to the *third group* (beyond time-limits) are not unallowable things of themselves, or unallowable by bhikkhus' conduct, but only that they are kept beyond the time allowed by Lord Buddha. Such things should be returned to the former owner when they are forfeited because he can use them again, — except medicines which are clearly recommended by the composer to be used in some other way. Things which are nissaggiya and under the first sub-heading 'due to the manner of receiving' should not be used again but those falling under the second and third sub-headings can be used again, — except in the case of rains-cloths which have been asked from prohibited persons. If the words of the Vibhaṅga are to be interpreted in an useful way, a thing to be forfeited should be forfeited first to the sangha, and secondly to a *gaṇa* where there are only a few bhikkhus living and a complete sangha is not available, and only after that to an individual bhikkhu when a *gaṇa* is not available, but the procedure mentioned above seems to be difficult for practice at present. Therefore the proper method of practice should be this: If the offence committed by a bhikkhu causes a bad rumour upsetting to the public, then (that thing to be forfeited, as for instance a robe asked for at the wrong time from people not relatives, etc) should be forfeited to the sangha. On the contrary, when the offence committed by a bhikkhu does not upset members of the public, (such as a bhikkhu keeping medicine for more than 7 days) that article should be forfeited to an individual. If the things to be forfeited should not be used again, the words of forfeiture should be: IMĀHAM NISSAJJĀMI, ("I forfeit this") leaving out the terms "*Saṅghassa*" (to the sangha) or "*Āyasmato*" (to you) because how can the sangha or an individual accept things which are unallowable!

The aim of confessing āpatti on the part of a bhikkhu is to declare himself purified of the offence committed. Things which are not allowable should be given to householders or else thrown away, according to the example of gold, silver or money. Things which are allowable should be returned to their former owners. In case of things which are to be forfeited but they have been lost so that there is nothing to forfeit, a bhikkhu should only confess an āpatti; but whether it should be to a sangha or to an individual should be known from what I have said above.

At present, the training-rules here which are easily broken by bhikkhus are few. I have explained them at length in order to show the way to students.

Offences from nissaggiya to the end (of the Pāṭimokkha) are regarded as light āpatti, and can be absolved through the process of *desanā* (confession) called *desanāgāminī* (approaching a sangha, gaṇa or a bhikkhu and confessing the offences committed). Thullaccaya are also included in this group.



## CHAPTER VII

### PĀCITTIIYA

#### Introduction.

This term has been explained already in Chapter VI. *Pācittiya* which does not require the procedure of forfeiture, is called by the distinctive name *Suddhika-pācittiya*, to distinguish it from *Nissaggiya-pācittiya*. The former means 'pure *pācittiya*' but in Pāli it is called only '*pācittiya*'.

The training-rules in this chapter are 92 in number, classified into nine sections. These sections have each ten training-rules except the eighth section, *Sahadhammikavagga*, consisting of twelve.

#### I. MUSĀVĀDA - VAGGA

- the Section on False Speech, first.

##### 1. The first sikkhāpada states:

In (uttering) false speech in full awareness there is (a case entailing) expiation. (1)

"*Sampajānamusāvāda*" means to utter false speech with full awareness. It should be understood in this way: There exists a certain matter but the speaker with intention utters words diverging from the truth about it, or makes gestures with the same intention, so that the other person there understands something differing from the truth. Physical actions, such as writing a letter which conveys falsehood are as complete (a breakage of this training-rule) as verbal communication and are counted in this training-rule also. The '*musāvāda*' referred to here covers

all aspects of falsehood not covered by other training-rules, therefore a bhikkhu who utters false speech which falls under the other training-rules having a heavier penalty, or he commits an offence of equal penalty, that is to say, another *pācittiya*, should be dealt with under that other training-rule. A bhikkhu who commits *musāvāda* apart from the above-mentioned has *pācittiya* in this training-rule.

The offence in this training-rule is *sacittaka* and therefore a bhikkhu who speaks with misunderstanding, who makes a slip of the tongue, that is, in speaking hurriedly cannot restrain himself; or who speaks making an error of speech, that is, who thinks to say one thing but who says another, is not *āpatti*. A bhikkhu who receives the words of another with pure intention to act accordingly but later acts in a different way, for example; a bhikkhu accepts an invitation (to a house, etc.) but later he does not go, commits *paṭissava* (breaking a promise) resulting in a *dukkata* coming to him, as said in another place.

## 2. The second sikkhāpada states:

In abusive speech there is (a case entailing) expiation. (2)

"*Omasavāda*" means abusive speech which pains the heart and should be understood thus: The speaker decides to give anguish to another or make him abashed by way of speech or gesture so that the listener will understand and become pained at heart. The bases of abuse are rank of birth (*jāti*), personal name, clan-name, work, art, disease, physical appearance, mental stains (*kilesa*), faults (*āpatti*) and other bases, which together make up the ten bases of *akkosavatthu* (bases of abuse).

The methods of abuse are divided into two: to pretend to praise by referring to *jāti* and so on, which is called sarcasm and ridicule; and to make another feel low by direct abuse. According to the words of this training-rule, it does not state specifically whom one abuses, but in the original story of the Vibhaṅga it is said that a bhikkhu quarrelling with another bhikkhu abuses him.



At the time of the classification of the various āpatti, it was said "A bhikkhu directly abuses another having *upasampadā*, the first is *pācittiya*. A bhikkhu abuses one with *upasampadā* but he does not indicate the latter but only insinuates or he abuses an *anupasampanna* directly or indirectly and in both cases he is *dukkata*. A bhikkhu does not aim at paining another or abashing him but only teases referring to the bases of *jāti* etc, is *dubbhāsita* (of wrong speech) whether he points out one with *upasampadā* or one without it, whether he mentions a particular person or only insinuates. The *dubbhāsita* offence is found only here in the *Vibhaṅga*.

The āpatti of this training-rule is *sacittaka* therefore a bhikkhu aiming at teaching Dhamma or giving instruction to others, who speaks about *jāti* (etc), is not āpatti.

### 3. The third sikkhāpada states:

In slander of a bhikkhu there is (a case entailing) expiation. (3)

The slandering words which are called "*pesuṇṇavāda*", should be understood thus: A bhikkhu hears the words of one party and then goes to tell another party in order to destroy the first, or vice versa, hoping that he will be liked by them; or else he speaks in ways desiring them to be parted to decrease their strength. The bases for slandering are ten in number, as above in the second training-rule. For example, a bhikkhu hears one party's words and tells another party, 'He has slandered you by referring to your *jāti* as such and such'. A bhikkhu who slanders another bhikkhu is *pācittiya*. When one party has *upasampadā* and the other not, or both parties are without *upasampadā*, a bhikkhu who slanders either is *dukkata*. Whether the parties become separated or not, is not the question here for a bhikkhu who does so is āpatti according to the basis. A bhikkhu who has already heard (words which can be used for slander) and has gone to inform about them but speaks in a different way and does not desire to be liked by them and does not desire to see them separated, is not āpatti.

It seems that this training-rule concerns true matters. If a bhikkhu tells a lie for slandering others, with the purpose of separating them, what āpatti comes to him? In a single case, I have never found the pattern for giving the āpatti according to different bases. It is impossible to give two pācittiya at the same time for different bases, namely, for uttering false speech and for slandering. The example of this story can be given: If a bhikkhu accused another of a baseless āpatti of saṅghādisesa, thus telling a lie, he is pācittiya because the saṅghādisesa is without base. Here a bhikkhu's main aim is to bring about separation and therefore I prefer to give him āpatti according to this training-rule but if the āpatti which should be given to him is only dukkaṭa then this, it seems, is too weak. The slandering false speech here is stronger than straight *musāvāda* and so my preference is to give a stronger āpatti. Āpatti of uttering false speech here is strong so pācittiya should be awarded. I should like to place this matter before the Vinaya-experts for their further investigation.

#### 4. The fourth sikkhāpada states:

Should any bhikkhu rehearse the Dhamma word by word (with text and commentary) together with one who is not fully admitted (to the Sangha), this entails expiation. (4)

"One who is not admitted (*anupasampanna*)" means one who is not a bhikkhu or a bhikkhuni. Some training-rules (using this phrase) refer only to the male sex, for example the rule dealing with sleeping with one who is anupasampanna, as in the next training-rule. But other training-rules refer to both male and female under this expression as in this training-rule. The term "Dhamma" means Pāli embracing the written Buddhist Teaching being Lord Buddha's sayings, His disciples' sayings, various hermits' sayings, and devatas' sayings. The phrase "to rehearse the Dhamma word by word" means to instruct either one or many to speak together. To begin together and to end together is regarded as to rehearse by '*pada*'. A bhikkhu speaks



leading them and those without *upasampadā* follow him with the next word rehearsing together to the end and this is called speaking together by *anupada*. In one *pada* to begin letters (*akkhara*) together or not together is regarded as to rehearse by *anuakkhara*. To end with the consonants (*byañjana*) together or not together, is called *anubyañjana*. The number of *āpatti* for a bhikkhu who instructs in any of the four ways mentioned above, depends on the number of efforts made in teaching in which there has been speaking together being limited by beginning and ending, time by time.

The *āpatti* of this training-rule is *acittaka* therefore though a bhikkhu is careful not to speak together yet mistakenly speaks together, he is also *āpatti*. A bhikkhu who recites together, who learns by heart together or who admonishes the one without *upasampadā* who has pronounced words etc, wrongly, is not included in this training-rule and is not *āpatti*.

To rehearse the Dhamma word by word referred to in this training-rule, was the method to teach others to memorize when there were no books. This method was formerly used in (Thai) temples, being popularly known by the name 'studying books in the evening'. The aim of prohibiting the pronunciation of words (etc), together, is clearly shown in the original story of this training-rule which was to prevent the pupils from looking down on the teacher.

## 5. The fifth sikkhāpada states:

Should any bhikkhu sleep for more than two or three nights along with one not fully admitted, this entails expiation. (5)

"*Anupasampanna*" here means one of male sex, one who is not a bhikkhu. What does "sleeping along with" mean? Does it mean sleeping upon the same spread of bedding, or in the same room? According to the original story of this training-rule, it suggests that Lord Buddha laid down this rule in order to prevent

householders from seeing the strange behaviour of some bhikkhus, which may differ from the behaviour of those restrained, while they are sleeping, giving displeasure to those who see them. "To sleep along with" refers to sleeping in a place where they can see each other. In the Vibhaṅga therefore, kinds of sleeping-place are classified thus: a completely-roofed place, a completely-walled place, and a mostly-roofed and mostly-walled place, the last being a house having roof and walls. According to the Commentary, if there is the same passage for entry and exit, irrespective of its stories and rooms, it is included under the heading of "the same sleeping place". When the house is small there is no question, about the Commentator's suggestion regarding the passage for entry, but when a house is built large, or many houses are joined together by passages if we follow the explanation of the Commentator, it is not convenient and impossible for the bhikkhu (living there) to prevent himself falling into āpatti.

I prefer to limit the 'sleeping-along-with' boundary according to the original aim for establishing this training-rule: in a house with many stories having many rooms where many live, a certain part inhabited by an individual where he sleeps should be fixed as the area defined by 'sleeping-along-with'. In comparison with the boundary in which a bhikkhu does not live apart from his three-robcs which is fixed by the house of many families, the room (or part of the house) in which one family dwells should be regarded as the boundary. The manner of 'sleeping-along-with' is to lie down at the same place irrespective of who lies down first, or lying down at the same time. This manner of doing it, fulfills the 'sleeping-along-with' and falling asleep or not sleeping is not included here. Later, there was Lord Buddha's allowance to sleep along with *anupasampanna* for two or three nights at most, because *sāmaṇeras* came into existence at that time, so that the aim of this training-rule is not truly fulfilled and it becomes only a ceremony practised by



bhikkhus. When 'three nights' is fixed, the term 'two nights' becomes useless and does not make for understanding but it is not superfluous because in other places we find the same sort of phrase, for example, "five or six words" which must be understood as the way of speaking (in Pāli) for ease of articulation. Since to sleep-along-with at night is mentioned here, sleeping-along-with in the day is not included. The limit of passing a night is determined by the beginning of dawn as laid down in other training-rules. The number of nights passed sleeping-along-with is not the point in question providing that one (or both) get up before dawn. There is a tradition of popular bhikkhu-practice (in Siam) that if the two people, one bhikkhu, one *anupasampanna*, sleep-along-with in the same boundary and have passed dawns the number of which are counted as the number of nights, they sleep-along-with for two nights but if on the third night they are separated, or one of them gets up before dawn, the number of nights of sleeping-along-with ceases and counting may begin again. If they have already passed three nights, then on the fourth evening when the sun sets, they must not lie down together even for a moment, but if they do the bhikkhu is *pācittiya*. Counting the times of lying down and getting up during the night of either party, there will be that number of *pācittiyas* for the bhikkhu.

Āpatti in this training-rule is *acittaka*. A bhikkhu cannot be immune from āpatti although he makes mistakes in counting the nights.

The offence of *dukkata* comes to the bhikkhu who sleeps-along-with in the place called 'half-roofed and half-walled' but such a place cannot be thought of! A place completely roofed but with no walls is like a open-sided *sālā* (meeting-hall); a place completely walled but with no roof is like a corral or sty; a place mostly roofed but not mostly walled, for example that open-sided *sālā* not completely roofed and partly walled but not to the half of it, such places mentioned above are not the places for sleeping-along-with so a bhikkhu who passes nights there with *anupasampanna* is not āpatti.

Let Vinaya students see how the practice of this training-rule has been so changed that it does not fulfill the original aim. It has become only ceremony. However, it has one advantage: to rouse one to get up early ! A bhikkhu should not use this training-rule to censure other bhikkhus who are not strict in this sikkhāpada because however it is observed, strictly or not, it is not different in result. In truth, a bhikkhu should use it as a concrete benefit, that is, not sleeping-along-with in the same room as a sāmaṇera or pupils when it is possible to choose, and to practise this will be the most useful.

#### 6. The sixth sikkhāpada states :

Should a bhikkhu sleep ( under the same roof ) along with a woman, this entails expiation. (6)

“*Mātugāma*” here means human female, even one born on that very day. All explanations should be understood as in the preceeding training-rule, but the difference is here that a bhikkhu is āpatti from the first night. When the sun sets, if a bhikkhu should lie down together with, he is āpatti. The composer said that *paṇḍaka* and female animals are the bases for dukkaṭa. Regarding female animals having sexual organs large enough for a bhikkhu to have intercourse with, if referring to their genitals and anus, it is reasonable but if referring to their mouth it is rather superfluous. This has led bhikkhus to dislike even the wall-gecko (tookah) which leads to a laughable situation !

#### 7. The seventh sikkhāpada states :

Should any bhikkhu teach more than five or six sentences of the Dhamma to a woman without a male (present) who knows the sense (of what is said), this entails expiation. (7)

“*Mātugāma*” here means a human female who knows the sense of what is said.



**8. The eighth sikkhāpada states :**

Should any bhikkhu announce to one who is not fully admitted any superhuman state ( of himself ), if it is true, this entails expiation. ( 8 )

**9. The ninth sikkhāpada states :**

Should any bhikkhu announce to one who is not fully admitted a bhikkhu's gross fault, unless it is with bhikkhus' permission, this entails expiation. ( 9 )

The Vibhaṅga explains that 'gross fault' means the four pārājikas and the thirteen saṅghādisesas but in the Atthakathā, the Commentators said that "gross fault" in this training-rule refers only to saṅghādisesas. But the compiler of the Samantapāsādikā has already admitted that a bhikkhu who abuses another who has committed pārājika and is understood to be pure by the first, is pācittiya according to the second training-rule of this chapter. A bhikkhu who announces the pārājika of the latter may be pācittiya according to the present training-rule but the compiler of the Samantapāsādikā still holds to the words of the original commentators saying that they know Lord Buddha's intention !

The aim of this training-rule should be understood thus : This training-rule was laid down to prevent bhikkhus exposing the faults of each other publicly. Suppose one bhikkhu knowing that another bhikkhu is pārājika does not warn him or does not accuse him according to tradition in the presence of the Sangha but instead of this, exposes him to an *anupasampanna* hoping to taunt him. A bhikkhu who does this to another, is he immune from āpatti here? I see that he will not be immune, therefore the words of the Vibhaṅga ( that gross fault = pārājika and saṅghādisesa ) are proper. But in order to remedy the stubbornness and shamelessness of some bhikkhus Lord Buddha allowed the sangha permission to delegate a bhikkhu to warn them. That act of delegation sometimes mentions the āpatti, sometimes mentions a family ( to which the evil-doer belongs ), sometimes

neither. A bhikkhu who is delegated for this duty by the sangha to warn the evil-doer, must do so according to the act of delegation and going beyond this he is *pācittiya*, so we need not speak about a bhikkhu not delegated to do this by the sangha. A bhikkhu who exposes an *āpatti* which is not gross, is *dukkata*.

#### 10. The tenth sikkhāpada states :

Should any bhikkhu dig the earth or have the earth dug, this entails expiation. (10)

The Vibhaṅga classifies earth as two kinds: natural earth is called *jātaṭṭhavi*, and unnatural (mixed or impure) earth known as *ajātaṭṭhavi*. The former refers to pure loam, pure clay or other kinds of soil mixed with a small quantity of pebbles, broken tiles, minerals and sand, having much loam and clay, and to earth not burnt by fire. Heaps of loam or of clay upon which rain has fallen for more than four months are included in the above. The latter refers to pure pebbles, broken tiles, minerals or pure sand or to earth having little loam and clay but mixed with a great quantity of other things. Earth which has been burnt also is not natural earth. Heaps of loam and clay upon which rain has fallen for less than four months are included under this heading.

Since there is no term here suggesting (intention), this training-rule seems to be *acittaka* but the Composer said that *āpatti* is *sacittaka*, because he might be concentrating upon a bhikkhu who walks making footprints without intention in the soil, not being *āpatti*. The term 'digging' clearly points out what the bhikkhu does, so a bhikkhu who treads on the soft soil making footprints is not *āpatti*, for this is not called digging! A bhikkhu who himself digs the earth or causes another to dig *jātaṭṭhavi*, even though he thinks that it is *ajātaṭṭhavi*, seems to have no word in this training-rule whereby he can excuse himself (from being *āpatti*). The Commentator suggested that a bhikkhu who hints at his desire to others without commanding them, is not *āpatti*.



This training-rule was laid down because the people of those days understood that *paṭhavi* (earth) possessed a faculty (of life). A bhikkhu (nowadays) need not be very careful about this matter if he behaves in accordance with the Commentator's suggestion so that he is not *āpatti*. This will be proper here.

## II. BHŪTAGĀMA-VAGGA

—the Section on Plants, second.

### 1. The first sikkhāpada states:

In causing plants to be damaged there is (a case entailing) expiation. (11)

"Bhūtagāma" is a special term and I am not sure of its literal meaning. Therefore, I do not explain further since I fear inaccuracy regarding this term. Here it means living plants where they are planted in a fixed place. The Composer divides these into five groups: (1) arising from bulbs, rhizomes or tubers, for example turmeric (or ginger), that is to say these kinds of roots are used for propagation; (2) arising from cuttings or stakes, for example the Bodhi-tree (or the willow); (3) arising from joints, for example sugar-cane or bamboo; (4) arising from runners (such as water-convolvulus, strawberries; in the original, *ajjuko* = (puk chee lom) = *Ocimum gratissimum* is given); (5) arising from seeds, as rice, beans or sesame.

According to the Commentary, the plants which have been removed from their places but can grow again are called *Bijagāma*. *Bhūtagāma* is the base of *pācittiya* while *bijagāma* is the base for *dukkāṭa*. A bhikkhu who removes *bhūtagāma* by himself or causes others to remove it is *pācittiya*. A bhikkhu who destroys *bijagāma* or causes others to destroy it is *dukkāṭa*.

The Commentator said that the *āpatti* of this training-rule is *sacittika* too. He might have understood that the aim of this training-rule is the same as that of preventing a bhikkhu from digging the earth. All explanation should be understood therefore according to the previous rule.

## 2. The second sikkhāpada states :

In replying evasively and in giving trouble (by remaining silent) there is (a case entailing) expiation. (12)

The explanation is as follows: a bhikkhu is accused of improper behaviour and has been questioned in the midst of the sangha but he does not want to reply truthfully and speaks evasively. In another case, he does not do as above but when he has been questioned, he keeps silent—which is called giving trouble to the sangha. There is the Exalted Buddha's permission for the sangha to announce that matter by *ñattidutiyakamma*. Such a *ñatti* or announcement referring to the first case here is called *aññavādakakamma*, while the announcement referring to the second case is called *vihesakakamma*. When the sangha has performed two kammās, or either kamma, a bhikkhu who insists on them repeating it is *pācittiya* according to what he has done. If the sangha has not performed any kamma, a bhikkhu doing this is *dukkata*.

The āpatti of this training-rule is *acittaka*. If the kamma is performed rightly by the sangha, a bhikkhu doing this with whatever intention is not immune from āpatti, excepting his behaviour is not regarded as either replying evasively or causing trouble to the sangha, for example, one who does not understand the question and asks the sangha to repeat it, or one who is ill and able to answer only with difficulty. The content of this training-rule should provide the pattern for a bhikkhu who, if he is accused and questioned about the case, should respect the examining sangha and should reply truthfully and not look down upon the sangha by covering up, by prevaricating or by remaining silent.

## 3. The third sikkhāpada states :

In disparaging and decrying (in private) there is (a case entailing) expiation. (13)

The explanation is as follows: There is a tradition in the sangha to designate some bhikkhus as those who will carry out



the communal duties of the sangha, such as: distributing shelter (*senāsanagahāpaka*), allotting food (*bhattuddesaka*) and so on. A bhikkhu who does not receive a pleasant allotment, for example, getting poor shelter and mean food — that is to say, he is sent to a poor donor instead of to a rich one, not understanding the tradition of the sangha or being disappointed and condemning the bhikkhu-official concerned in the presence of other bhikkhus, is called 'one who disparages'. A bhikkhu who does not do this but blames the bhikkhu-officials showing his displeasure privately not intending to be heard by others, is called 'one who decries'. If the bhikkhu-officials have carried out their duties rightly, a bhikkhu who disparages, or decries (in private), is *pācittiya*.

The Vibhaṅga explains that a bhikkhu who disparages or decries in the presence of *upasampanna* is *pācittiya* and one who does this in the presence of *anupasampanna* is *dukkata*. What does this explanation mean? The content of the training-rule does not make this matter clear. Let the Vinaya experts ponder further about it. A bhikkhu who disparages or decries another bhikkhu who has not been appointed by the sangha (to some duty) but who carries this out voluntarily, is *dukkata*. It is said that *āpatti* does not fall upon a bhikkhu who disparages or decries another bhikkhu who carries out his duty improperly and who is carried away by prejudice and bias. I prefer to understand the preceeding statement as meaning that one who speaks according to the truth without intention to disparage or to decry, is not *āpatti*, but in the opposite case, it seems to me that one who disparages or decries with intention to dishonour another bhikkhu cannot be immune from *dukkata* because it is not a good way of conduct for a bhikkhu.

#### 4. The fourth sikkhāpada states:

Should any bhikkhu spread out in the open or get spread out (in the open) a bed or bench or mattress or chair belonging to the Sangha and on departing neither put it away nor get it put away and then should go without taking leave, this entails expiation. (14)

At all times except in the Rainy season, there is Lord Buddha's permission for bhikkhus to place these furnishings under a tent or under a tree's shade where birds and so on will not foul them with droppings. Furnishings belonging to the sangha are the base for *pācittiya* while those belonging to another excepting his own are the base for *dukkata*. Those belonging to himself are the base for *anāpatti* (without fault). Since this training-rule mentions clearly the kinds of furnishings, other furnishings such as mats, planks of wood and so on whether belonging to the sangha or to an individual, it is said are the base of *dukkata*. It is not forbidden to use in the open air the furnishings mentioned in this training-rule, but it is prohibited to abandon them, therefore a bhikkhu if he is taking leave should put them away, or get them put away, or request another to put them away (after his leaving), so that he will not be *āpatti*. If a bhikkhu first sits on (uses) it but then it is afterwards used by another, then the duty is transferred to the second person, or if there is an emergency and he has to go quickly, then in these two cases the *āpatti* does not fall upon him. To dry the furnishings is not included here.

This training-rule has been laid down to restrain a bhikkhu from carelessness and to teach him to preserve these furnishings and is thus good conduct for adoption by bhikkhus.

#### 5. The fifth sikkhāpada states:

Should any bhikkhu spread out bedding, or get it spread out, in a lodging belonging to the Sangha and on departing neither put it away nor get it put away and then should go without taking leave, this entails expiation. (15)

"Bedding" here means mattress, mat and bedclothes and other such things but does not include the bed, or benches which are placed (here or there and not spread with bedding). The term "*vihāra*" means a living-shelter which is commonly called in the present time '*kuṭī*' (bhikkhu's lodging). A *vihāra* belonging to the sangha is the base of *pācittiya* while a *vihāra* belonging to



another, excepting his own, is the base of dukkaṭa. A *vihāra* belonging to himself is the base of *anāpatti*. It is not pointed out clearly here to whom "bedding" belongs. According to the Commentary, the words there suggest rather that it belongs to the sangha. The explanation according to the original story of this training-rule is that a bhikkhu doing like this, could ruin both bedding and kuṭi (leaving them open to attack) by termites.

But I understand that this training-rule emphasizes obstructing the place or the way therefore the bedding should not be taken as belonging to anyone (whether sangha or others). If emphasis is laid on the ruination of the things, then the explanation saying that it belong to the sangha, is right. Since this training-rule points out only the bedding, therefore dukkaṭa comes to a bhikkhu who places bedframe, bench (and so on) in the *vihāra* belonging to the sangha (not putting them away). A bedframe and bench are large things and cause much obstruction, and for them to be only the base of dukkaṭa, seems a small āpatti but the commentator said in the *Atthakathā* that since the bedframe and bench cannot be ruined immediately by termites, a bhikkhu who sets them out and then leaves them is only dukkaṭa. Since this training-rule mentions "*vihāra*" the Vibhaṅga explained that the eating-hall (*upaṭṭhānasāla*) and other places are the basis of dukkaṭa. The Commentator further explained in the *Atthakathā* that only bedding may be ruined there but not the living-place (*senāsana*) so only a dukkaṭa comes to a bhikkhu. "To take leave" in this training-rule means to go for good. If a bhikkhu expects to come back he is not regarded as abandoning things and though he does not put them away, yet he is not āpatti. The remaining explanation should be understood as in the previous sikkhāpada.

This training-rule should be the example for a bhikkhu who is going to dwell in another place. He should not abandon his own belongings which will obstruct and fill the space in the *senāsana* belonging to the sangha in which other bhikkhus will come to dwell.

## 6. The sixth sikkhāpada states:

Should any bhikkhu in a lodging belonging to the Sangha knowingly lie down in such a way as to encroach on a bhikkhu who arrived there before him (thinking), "Being cramped for room he will go away", having done it for that purpose and no other, it entails expiation. (16)

The explanation is as follows: If that *vihāra* belonging to the sangha has been occupied beforehand by a senior bhikkhu or a sick bhikkhu and another bhikkhu knowingly enters there to lie down in such a way as to encroach upon the area surrounding the former, that is to say, near his bedframe, near his bench or in the entry-passage without having sufficient reason to do so, (that latecomer) is *pācittiya*. A bhikkhu who does this in a private *vihāra*, excepting his own, is *dukkata*. A bhikkhu who does this in the area surrounding the *vihāra* or in another place which is not the living-place of a particular person such as in an eating-hall, in a tent, under the shade of trees, or in the open air, is *dukkata*. A bhikkhu who does so in his own *vihāra* is not *āpatti*. If there is a reason which compels him to enter when he is ill, or cold, or very hot, or there is some danger outside such as someone pursuing to strike him, a bhikkhu who enters a *vihāra* belonging to the sangha wishing for temporary shelter, is not *āpatti*.

This training-rule has been laid down with the purpose of recognizing the privileges of the previous occupants who are staying in the places common to all bhikkhus.

## 7. The seventh sikkhāpada states:

Should any bhikkhu being angry and displeased drive a bhikkhu out of a lodging belonging to the Sangha or have him driven out, it entails expiation. (17)

The purpose of this training-rule is to prevent a bhikkhu fighting for a lodging. It is not wrong to understand that this is



the continuation of the previous *sikkhāpada*, that is to say, when a bhikkhu has entered in such a way as to encroach upon the previous occupant by sitting or by lying down, hoping to drive him out but not being successful, he drags or drives him away. A bhikkhu who takes out (of the *vihāra*) the previous occupant's requisites, is *dukkata*. The remaining explanations should be understood as in the previous *sikkhāpada*.

A bhikkhu who drives away his *saddhivihārika* or *antevāsika* (resident pupil monks) because of their bad behaviour, or drives away from the wat a bhikkhu who it is not proper should live there, is not included in this rule.

#### 8. The eighth *sikkhāpada* states:

Should any bhikkhu sit down or lie down (suddenly) on a bed or bench with detachable legs on a loft (with an incompletely planked floor) in a lodging belonging to the Sangha, it entails expiation. (18)

There are many kinds of beds, one of which, mentioned in this training-rule has detachable legs called '*āhaccapāda*' which are not pegged but merely fit into sockets. A 'loft' here means a framework which is made in a *vihāra* by putting in posts and fixing beams to them high enough so that the head does not touch the ceiling. If planks of wood are not laid on (the beams, the frame work of) the bed is laid on them instead with the bed's legs hanging below. This kind of loft is known as a *vehāsa-kuṭi* and bhikkhus can live both on the ground and in the loft.

I understand that such kinds of *kuṭi* are made by people who do not know how to build houses of many stories. Even in later times, people used to make lofts in brick buildings standing on the earth, to avoid moisture. The original story of this training-rule is thus: A bhikkhu sits down forcefully upon his bed and its legs fall down and hit the head of the bhikkhu sitting below. Because of this, Lord Buddha has laid down this training-rule to prevent a bhikkhu sitting down in this manner. The above

explanation is clear but why is the phrase "a *vihāra* belonging to the Sangha" repeated here? Moreover, the Vibhaṅga mentions this as the base of a three-factored *pācittiya* (*tika-pācittiya*) but I do not understand this statement. But I do see the importance of the bed and the loft. Or such a *vihāra* may be regarded as belonging to the sangha and may be allotted to other bhikkhus, such as some allotted to that lodging in the loft and some below. It is proper if it is explained like this. Therefore Lord Buddha has forbidden bhikkhus to live in such a dwelling-place except when this *vehāsakuṭi* is strongly constructed. For this reason the Vibhaṅga explains that if the loft is not higher than head-level the ground-floor is not used as a dwelling-place, or if the loft is completely floored, or if the legs of the bed or of the bench are firmly pegged so that when sat upon its legs will not fall down, a bhikkhu who sits down in or lies down upon such a loft is not *āpatti*.

#### 9. The ninth sikkhāpada states:

When a bhikkhu is having a large residence constructed steadying the door from the door-frame (and) arranging the window, he should stand in a place without green crops (while) putting material on for roofing (or plastering), two or three layers. If he should put on more than that though he stands in the area without green crops, it entails expiation. (19)

The Pāli terms and meanings of this training-rule are very difficult to understand. I am not sure that my translation above is correct. If I speak about the points which should be discussed, it will be longer than I desire. I shall speak about the cause of laying down this training-rule in order to show the way in which Vinaya experts may ponder it further. According to the original story, Bhikkhu Channa plastered his *vihāra* which was already constructed very often and that *vihāra* could not bear the weight and collapsed. He himself collected grass and wood thereby destroying the cornfields of a certain brahmin. Lord Buddha spoke about this event and laid down this training-rule.



### 10. The tenth sikkhāpada states:

Should any bhikkhu knowingly pour water with living things in it onto grass or earth or should he have it so poured, it entails expiation. (20)

“Water with living things” means the small creatures born in water, for example, mosquito larvae. Because of the term “knowingly”, āpatti in this training-rule is *sacittaka*. Though the water has living creatures in it, yet a bhikkhu understanding it has none, and pouring it down, is not āpatti.

### III. OVĀDA-VAGGA

#### —the Section on Exhortation, third.

All training-rules in this chapter are concerned with the *bhikkhunī*. Therefore, it is better to speak first about the origin of bhikkhunis. At the time when the Exalted One was carrying out the works of a Buddha, His Teaching spread widely. In the Middle Enlightenment period (*majjhima bodhi-kāla*) Queen *Mahāpajāpatī Gotamī*, Queen-consort of King *Suddhodhana*, Lord Buddha's father, she who was His aunt and who took care of the Exalted One when he was young, since Queen *Mahāmāyā*—his mother—had passed away, decided to get upasampadā as bhikkhunī and requested many times His consent to do so but He did not grant this, thinking that in future if women can be ordained his Teaching would not last long. Later when the Exalted Buddha was staying in *Vesālī*, Phra Ānanda Thera asked him a question: “Can women who obtain ordination win to the special dhammas?” (of ariyamagga, etc). When the Exalted Buddha replied that they could do so, Phra Ānanda requested His permission to have Queen *Mahāpajāpatī Gotamī* ordained as a bhikkhunī. The Exalted One thinking that women were competent persons to obtain (the ariyamagga, etc) and equal in this respect to men, granted his permission for the Queen to be ordained as bhikkhunī, —on the condition that she willingly accepted some rules. In short, a bhikkhunī must always pay respects to a bhikkhu and take

second place to him and never put herself on the same level as a bhikkhu, having to lead her life dependent on the bhikkhusangha, not being independent of it. *Queen Gotamī* was the first bhikkhuni in the Sāsana. After that, the Exalted Buddha permitted bhikkhus to undertake the ordination of *Queen Gotamī's* retinue who were princesses of the Sakiyan clan, by the process of *ñatti-catuttha-kamma*. Later, a woman who asked for *upasampadā*, when she was being examined regarding the obstacles (*antarāyikadhamma*) in the presence of *bhikkhusangha*, became shy, so the Exalted Buddha allowed her to be examined first by the *bhikkhunīsangha* getting *upasampadā* there, then going to get the second *upasampadā* in the presence of the *bhikkhusangha* where she was not examined again and got the *upasampadā* by immediate announcement to become a bhikkhuni without examination. A bhikkhuni who got *upasampadā* only in the *bhikkhusangha* or only in the *bhikkhunīsangha* and (in the latter case) who does not get *upasampadā* again from the *bhikkhusangha* is called *Ekato-upasampannā* and is not regarded as a full-fledged bhikkhuni as meant by definition in the training-rules. A bhikkhuni who got the complete *upasampadā* in the presence of both sanghas (*bhikkhunīsangha* first) is called *Ubhato-upasampannā*, becoming thereby full-fledged bhikkhuni according to definition.

The bhikkhunis have the same training-rules, and traditions called *Sāḥjīva* (lit: same life), as the bhikkhus, but some training-rules are different. The training-rules for bhikkhunis were strictly laid down to limit the spread of the bhikkhuni, therefore they have disappeared for a long time. In the First *Sangāyana* bhikkhunis were not mentioned at all. In the Second *Sangāyana*, they were named but only obscurely and were not concerned with that matter. In the Third *Sangāyanā*, the *Bhikkhunī Sanghamittā*, a Princess and Emperor Asoka's daughter, was mentioned. She was ordained as bhikkhuni and then went to establish the bhikkhunīsangha in *Sri Lankā* (Ceylon). The truth of this story should be investigated.



Now I shall speak about the training-rules.

**1. The first sikkhāpada states:**

Should any bhikkhu exhort bhikkhunis without permission (of bhikkhus), it entails expiation. ( 21 )

It is a tradition for bhikkhunis to be exhorted fortnightly by the bhikkhusangha. If they miss this exhortation, bhikkhunis are pācittiya. This is one of the Eight Garudhamma (solemn vows) which *Mahāpajāpatī Gotamī* promised to observe when she was ordained. A bhikkhu for exhorting the bhikkhunis had to be permitted by the bhikkhusangha. A bhikkhu who exhorts bhikkhunis without the sangha's permission, is pācittiya.

**2. The second sikkhāpada states:**

Even if he has permission, should a bhikkhu exhort bhikkhunis after sundown, it entails expiation. ( 22 )

**3. The third sikkhāpada states:**

Should any bhikkhu go to the bhikkhunis' quarters and exhort bhikkhunis, unless it is the proper occasion, it entails expiation. Herein the proper occasion is this: a bhikkhuni is sick. This is the proper occasion here. (23)

**4. The fourth sikkhāpada states:**

Should any bhikkhu say thus; "Bhikkhus exhort bhikkhunis for material gain", it entails expiation. (24)

**5. The fifth sikkhāpada states:**

Should any bhikkhu give a cloth to a bhikkhuni not related to him unless it is in exchange, it entails expiation. (25)

**6 .The sixth sikkhāpada states:**

Should any bhikkhu sew a cloth or have it sewn for a bhikkhuni not related to him, it entails expiation. ( 26 )

**7. The seventh sikkhāpada states:**

Should any bhikkhu by appointment set out to travel on the same journey with a bhikkhuni even to go through one village, unless it is the proper occasion, it entails expiation. Herein the proper occasion is this: the journey is to be undertaken by a caravan and is reputed to be dangerous and risky (on account of robbers). This is the proper occasion here. ( 27 )

**8. The eighth sikkhāpada states:**

Should any bhikkhu by appointment embark with a bhikkhuni on a boat going upstream or downstream, unless it is (merely) to cross to the other bank, it entails expiation. ( 28 )

**9. The ninth sikkhāpada states:**

Should any bhikkhu knowingly eat almsfood procured through (the instigation of) a bhikkhuni, unless it was already intended by householders (for bhikkhus), it entails expiation. ( 29 )

**10. The tenth sikkhāpada states:**

Should any bhikkhu seat himself together with a bhikkhuni, one man and one woman alone, it entails expiation. ( 30 )

These training-rules are clear in their meaning. Moreover, they are now out of date and though there are some points to be discussed here, yet I should withhold explanation as this is not necessary and as I am afraid of delay.



#### IV. BHOJANA-VAGGA — The Section on Food, fourth.

The training-rules in this chapter deal with softer foods (*bhojana*). It is proper to make clear these kinds of softer foods to gain a preliminary understanding. The Vibhaṅga divides *bhojana* into five categories, namely: boiled rice (*odana*), moist sweets (*kummāsa* = curds), dry sweets (*sattu* = parched barley flour), fish, and flesh. All kinds of grain which have been boiled such as ordinary rice and glutinous rice, and which have been prepared in various ways, such as boiled rice, 'oily-rice' (mixed with coconut cream), or 'fried-rice' (mixed with pork-fat, chopped meat, vegetables, etc), are all included in '*odana*'. *Kummāsa* means fresh, moist sweets which soon become rotten when kept beyond time, such as sweets compounded from flour, sugar, coconut-cream, etc. *Sattu* means dry cakes which do not become rotten, such as breads and biscuits (which can be kept for a while). 'Fish' which can be used as food includes shellfish, prawns and other water creatures. 'Flesh' means the meat of land-animals and birds which can be used as food. Various kinds of fruit and roots such as yams (underground tubers) are called *khādaniya*—harder food. It seems that this referred to food which had to be bitten and chewed so it is not included in *bhojana* (softer food) yet it is also a kind of food. The difference between them will be explained clearly in the training-rules below.

##### 1. The first sikkhāpada states:

Any bhikkhu who is not sick may eat one meal at a (public) food-distribution centre. If he should eat more than that, it entails expiation. (31)

'Food' here is referred to by the term '*pinḍa*' meaning 'a lump of boiled rice', while the Vibhaṅga describes it as any of the five kinds of *bhojana*. It seems to me that the understanding of one who studies Vinaya in this way will be rather narrow if referring only to edible things. If he understands it as covering the action of eating, his understanding will be wider than before.

There are many kinds of eating among common people, such as, regular meals and snacks. Meals are set at regular times—breakfast, lunch and dinner are examples of this, and people eat to their full satisfaction and nourish their life. Edible things at that time were boiled rice with curries made of fish and meat, sometimes followed by sweets. But in eating a snack one does not eat to the full and it is not set at a regular time, such as what is called 'eating little and often' between meals. At the time of a snack, people eat things which are sometimes called *bhojana* such as sweets and they eat them with tea. Even then their snack is not called a regular meal. By regarding the things to be eaten the understanding of the Vinaya student is confused, but if he regards the action of eating it will help him to understand this matter. The action of eating a meal in this training-rule refers to the regular meal.

Now we come to a meal in a public food distribution centre. Such food is not prepared for a particular person or a particular group, so that it is not made with the intention to offer only to *bhikkhus*. All travellers or hungry people can resort to the centre for it. A *bhikkhu* who is not sick and who can go out, can eat a meal in a food distribution centre like this only once when he has arrived there. If he eats more often than that, he is *pācittiya*. In the *Vibhanga*, *āpatti* comes to a *bhikkhu* at every swallowing of food. My preference here is to understand that the *āpatti* should be measured by the number of times of eating. If he is sick and cannot go out from that place, he can take food many times until he is fit to leave and *āpatti* will not come to him. If a *bhikkhu* misses food one day then he can eat again, for example, if a *bhikkhu* on the way to a certain place should take food at such a centre one day and then depart, returning after one or more days, he may eat there again. If the owner of such a centre invites a *bhikkhu* and wishes to offer food to a *bhikkhu* then the *bhikkhu* can accept it more than once. If the food is not prepared for public distribution, it is not included in this training-rule.



## 2. The second sikkhāpada states :

In eating in groups (of four or more among families) there is (a case entailing) expiation unless it is the proper occasion. Herein the proper occasion is this: an occasion of sickness, an occasion of giving cloths, an occasion of making-up cloths, an occasion of going on a journey, an occasion of embarking on a boat, an extraordinary occasion (where one hundred or one thousand bhikkhus gather), an occasion of a meal supplied by samanās. This is the proper occasion here. (32)

Now we shall explain according to the traditions of the past. According to the Vibhaṅga, this matter is explained as more than four bhikkhus accepting an invitation in which any of the five softer foods are mentioned. In short, bhikkhus who accept an invitation mentioning by name any of these five, are called 'those eating in a group', for example, someone invited bhikkhus to come and eat pancake (lit: 'tile-cake'), or Thai vermicelli (lit: strand-cake) not being covered by any of the occasions (*samaya*, allowing eating in a group—see below) mentioned in the training-rule. Bhikkhus who accept and eat are *pācittiya* for every mouthful swallowed. But in the *Atthakathā*, the Commentator explained that the actions of accepting an invitation together and in the same place are the main points here. Whether the bhikkhus eat in the same place or in separate places is not important.

Of the occasions mentioned in the training-rule, an occasion of sickness means when bhikkhus are sick and cannot go for *piṇḍapāta*; an occasion of giving robes means the fourth month of the rainy season when a *kāṭhina*-robe is not yet offered to them. If a *kāṭhina*-robe has already been offered to them, the duration of this (a *kāṭhina*-privilege), extends a further four months to the end of the cold season, such an occasion being called *cīvara-dānasamaya* or *cīvara-kāla-samaya*. An occasion of making robes means the time when bhikkhus make robes by themselves, for in those days bhikkhus themselves cut and sewed

robes for their own use and since they may not have been skilful and had many concerns so many privileges were specially allowed for such occasions; an occasion of going on a journey refers to a distance of more than half a yojana; an occasion of embarking on a boat means when a bhikkhu travels by boat but the distance of the journey is not fixed but it should be comparable with distance mentioned above; an extraordinary occasion means when few bhikkhus live in one place almsfood may be enough for them but when many bhikkhus gather, it will not be sufficient; an occasion of a meal supplied by samanas means, when the latter invite bhikkhus (or when bhikkhus invite other bhikkhus). When any of these occasions arise, bhikkhus can eat in groups and they are not āpatti.

When there is understanding in this matter, there is a traditional practice (by bhikkhus and supporters) that bhikkhus do not accept the invitations of those who mention the names of the softer foods to be offered. The inviter who understands this, makes invitation just in this way: "I invite you to take breakfast (*piṇḍapāta* or *bhikkhā*) or lunch". By saying this, it is possible for bhikkhus to accept.

Because of the term '*gaṇa*' (group) in this case, it is said that it refers to more than four bhikkhus, so it is explained that two or three bhikkhus eating together (in a house), or two or three who go for *piṇḍapāta*, return and eat together—they are not āpatti. Food known by various names such as '*niccayabhatta*' (regular food) and so on being accepted by a bhikkhu, is perhaps not included in the case of mentioning the name of the food, so it is said that there is no āpatti for a bhikkhu who receives it. The reason is that those foods, excepting the five softer foods, are not the base of āpatti.

I am not sure that the explanations of the term '*gaṇabhojana*' are right because they do not give benefit to bhikkhus who are covered by some of the (seven) occasions. There is another way to understand this: those who sit round the dishes of food and eat



are called 'eating in a circle', and from this it should be called 'eating in a group'. According to the traditions of both brahmins and bhikkhus at the time of eating, they sit in rows and not around as in a circle. Perhaps this training-rule forbids (bhikkhus) to eat in circles like this. By understanding thus, bhikkhus who set forth on a journey, who travel by boat, who suffer from food scarcity, and who at the same time have received the special permission of the Buddha, will feel much at ease.

But how can a sick bhikkhu feel at ease and how can a bhikkhu feel at ease on the occasions of giving and making robes? This is not yet clear. It seems that '*gaṇabhojana*' is not an entirely wrong action so the Exalted Buddha allowed bhikkhus to do it on some occasions, for sometimes it is suitable according to those seven occasions. I request the Vinaya-experts to investigate further into this matter.

Āpatti in this training-rule is a *acittaka* and although it is real *gaṇabhojana* yet a bhikkhu who understands that it is not, is *pācittiya* inevitably. If it is not one of the occasions allowed by the Exalted Buddha, a bhikkhu who understands in this way cannot be immune from āpatti.

### 3. The third sikkhāpada states:

In substituting a meal (for another meal for which an invitation has already been accepted earlier), there is (a case entailing) expiation, unless it is the proper occasion. Herein the proper occasion is this: an occasion of sickness, an occasion of giving robes, an occasion of making-up robes. This is the proper occasion here. (33)

The Vibhaṅga explains that when a bhikkhu has accepted an invitation to partake of any of the five 'softer-foods' and then left aside that invitation gone elsewhere to partake of any of the five 'softer-foods', this is called 'the food coming after' (meaning a substituted meal). If the action of eating is

emphasized here as I have suggested at the beginning of this chapter, it will lead to a better understanding: in this training-rule a bhikkhu who has accepted an invitation to partake of a meal at one place but does not go there, going instead to partake of food at that time to someone else making a later invitation, this action is called *paramparabhojanā* (a substituted meal). Why does the Exalted Buddha allow bhikkhus to do this on three occasions? This matter should be investigated. According to my idea (these allowances) do not invalidate the (good) tradition. Furthermore, in the original story of this training-rule the Exalted Buddha allowed bhikkhus to 'vikap' (to share and change) it, that is, to give the first invitation to another bhikkhu while that bhikkhu goes to partake at a place making a later invitation. It seems to me that in those days this tradition was not strictly practised but at present one should hold in mind the following explanation: If a donor does not invite mentioning bhikkhus' names, requiring only a full number of bhikkhus, and the *Bhattuddesaka* shares out the invitations, such invitations as this can be 'vikapped' to another bhikkhu; but should an inviter mention the names of bhikkhus, to 'vikap' this sort of invitation is not proper unless a bhikkhu has first sought the consent of the inviter. An invitation to accept *piṇḍapāta* is not included under this rule. This training-rule is also *acittaka*.

#### 4. The fourth sikkhāpada states:

Should a family invite a bhikkhu who has arrived to accept cakes or biscuits, two or three bowlfuls can be accepted by the bhikkhu if he wishes. If he should accept more than that it entails expiation. Having accepted two or three bowlfuls and brought them back from there, he should share them with (other) bhikkhus. This is the proper course here. (34)

The cakes mentioned in this training-rule refer to the offerings made on the occasion of marriage. The biscuits refer to



provisions for a journey. If a bhikkhu accepts a great quantity of those offerings he will cause difficulty. Therefore, the Exalted Buddha allowed a bhikkhu to accept three bowlfuls at most. Having left that place, he should inform bhikkhus and share with them so that they do not approach that place again. A bhikkhu who does not do accordingly is dukkaṭa, while other bhikkhus who have been informed yet approach that place are dukkaṭa. Because the emphasis (in the Vibhaṅga) is laid on the occasion of marriage and on provisions for a journey, so the Vibhaṅga says that a bhikkhu who accepts things which have not been prepared for these occasions, or who accepts the things remaining over (in the case of these two occasions), or who accepts the things which remain in the case when either of these two are given up, is not āpatti. And it is allowed (in the Vibhaṅga) to accept from people who are relatives, or from regular inviters, or to accept it for the use of others. But these first two factors can cause difficulty and the last one contradicts the first explanation. There is no question regarding the things which a bhikkhu can obtain from the resources made available to him.

I prefer to understand that this training-rule was laid down for teaching bhikkhus knowledge of proper limits and teaching them also to protect families against loss (since some families may be inclined to be too generous). Things which are not prepared for offering on the occasion of marriage or for the provision of a journey such as goods which are sold should also be included under this training-rule. Provided that this last statement is born in mind, it is not so important when bhikkhus accept from relatives and from regular inviters. The Vinaya experts should investigate this matter further.

##### **5. The fifth sikkhāpada states:**

Should any bhikkhu who has eaten and (then) refused (further offered food), chew or consume harder foods or softer foods that are not left over (from what has been accepted by a bhikkhu), it entails expiation. (35)

This training-rule was laid down to save the face of the donor. If a bhikkhu accepts an invitation to have a meal in one place and that food is not agreeable to him so that he eats only a little refusing to be served with more and then goes to partake of food at another place, it must seem as though the donors could not feed him to his satisfaction causing them to become ashamed, as related in the original story of this training-rule. When this training-rule was laid down a bhikkhu could not do this.

The term '*bhuttāvī*' means 'having had a main meal' and whether or not he has eaten to his satisfaction is not important as he has given up his meal. The term '*pavārīto*' means refusing the food which is to be offered. The following are the constituent factors:

- i) one is eating a meal;
- ii) someone offers a meal;
- iii) that person is within forearm's length (*hatthapāsa*);
- iv) and offering food;
- v) and the bhikkhu refusing.

When these constituent factors are all present, a bhikkhu is called 'one who refuses further food'. A bhikkhu who has eaten and refused further food in this way, can eat more on that day only from things which are left over.

There are two kinds of things which are left over:

- i) things left over from a sick bhikkhu, and
- ii) things left over by a (normal) bhikkhu.

The latter means food which is allowable for a bhikkhu. A certain bhikkhu who had been offered food and accepted it and eaten some of it, did not get up from his seat but handed it over to a bhikkhu who had refused food and who is within *hatthapāsa* saying, "I have had enough". Because of managing in this way, it is said that this procedure is called *vinayakamma* (an action according to Vinaya), which it seems to me is rather suitable. It seems to me that such things which are left over are allowed for



a bhikkhu who can eat only a little (of his main meal) which is insufficient to maintain his body and so has to eat very often having to refuse further foods, as for example, a bhikkhu who has always nausea or vomiting.

A bhikkhu who has eaten and refused further food and who eats either harder or softer foods which are not left over, is dukkata while he is accepting them, and pācittiya while swallowing them. There is one āpatti for every mouthful swallowed. Things which are not food, are not included under this training-rule.

#### 6. The sixth sikkhāpada states:

Should any bhikkhu invite a bhikkhu who has eaten and (then) refused (further offered food) to accept harder foods or softer foods that are not left over (from what has been accepted by a bhikkhu, saying) knowingly and wishing to find fault, "Here, bhikkhu, chew this, or consume this", (then) in the eating, there is (a case entailing) expiation. (36)

All explanations are the same as the preceeding training-rule, except that the āpatti here is *sacittaka*.

#### 7. The seventh sikkhāpada states:

Should any bhikkhu chew or consume harder foods or softer foods outside the (proper) time, it entails expiation. (37)

The time outside the proper time (*vikāla*) in this training-rule is explained in the Vibhanga as the time after noon until dawn. According to the seventh training-rule of the *Rattandhakāravagga*, *Pācittiyakkhandha* of the *Bhikkhunī-pāṭimokkha* in the *Bhikkhunī-vibhanga*, the *vikāla* (time) is explained as from sunset until the dawn. According to the *Singālovāda Sutta*, *Dighanikāya*, *Pāṭika-vagga*, concerning roaming about in the

*vikāla* which is one of the factors 'leading-to-disaster' *vikāla* means night-time. Therefore two kinds of *vikāla* should be distinguished, the first method being the division of time into *kāla* and *vikāla*, while the second classifies *kāla* as *purebhatta* (before the meal), that is, morning till noon, *pacchābhatta* (after meal), that is, afternoon till late evening, and *vikāla*, which here means night. But *vikāla* in this training-rule is generally accepted as noon till dawn.

Āpatti in this training-rule is *acittaka*. If it is really *vikāla* and a bhikkhu understands that it is *kāla*, or he is in doubt, and he eats food, then he cannot escape from āpatti. The other sorts of things allowable by time (*kālika*) apart from *yāvakālīka* (allowable from dawn till noon) are not included here and a bhikkhu can consume them according to the Exalted Buddha's permission.

#### 8. The eighth sikkhāpada states:

Should any bhikkhu chew or consume any harder foods or softer foods that have been stored up (by him beyond noon), it entails expiation. (38)

To store up is known in Māgadhi as '*sannidhi*'. Harder and softer foods which have already been received by a bhikkhu, that is to say, have reached a bhikkhu's hands on one day and are stored up by him overnight in order to consume them the next day, are called '*sannidhi*'. A bhikkhu who consumes such things is *pācittiya* and an āpatti comes to him at every mouthful swallowed. Āpatti in this training-rule is also *acittaka*.

#### 9. The ninth sikkhāpada states:

There are the following fine foods, namely, ghee, butter, oil, honey, molasses, fish, meat, milk, and curd. Should any bhikkhu who is not sick having asked for such fine foods for his own use consume them, it entails expiation. (39)



Among the fine foods, some are foods in themselves, such as, fish, meat, milk and curds. The five remaining are sometimes medicines, therefore in this case one should understand that they are constituents (mixed in) the food. A bhikkhu who is not sick means one who can be at ease without taking these fine foods.

Āpatti in this training-rule is also *acittaka*. A sick bhikkhu will not be at ease without these fine foods so he is allowed to ask for them. When a sick bhikkhu requests these things for his own use, a bhikkhu who is not sick can also consume them. A bhikkhu who is not sick can request them from his relatives or from his regular inviters for his own use, or he can request them from others for a sick bhikkhu's use and in neither case will he be āpatti. There is no question regarding the things which a bhikkhu can obtain from the resources made available to him.

#### 10. The tenth sikkhāpada states:

Should any bhikkhu convey to the opening of his mouth food that has not been given (into his hands), except for (pure) water and tooth-sticks, it entails expiation. (40)

*Āhāra* in other places means *yāvakālika* but here since there is the exception of (pure) water and toothsticks, it refers to general eatable things. Water should be understood as ordinary water and does not refer to soups, sugarcane-juice and so on. Toothsticks should be understood as non-edible. The term '*adinnaṃ*' means, it was not offered into a bhikkhu's hands.

The factors of offering should be understood as follows:

- i) the things to be offered are not so big and heavy that a man of middling stature cannot lift them ;
- ii) the offerer comes within *hatthapāsa* ;
- iii) he has a humble manner when offering ;

- iv) the manner of offering can be done through direct bodily contact, through objects in contact with the body, or giving by throwing; and
- v) a bhikkhu receives it through direct bodily contact, or through objects in contact with his body.

Giving and receiving mentioned above, except by throwing, are done through mutual respect and polite behaviour. But as regards giving by throwing, I do not know (the Vibhanga's) meaning. Perhaps it may have been the manner of giving many small things to a crowd and maybe it was not regarded as impolite. According to the factors of offering, *piṇḍapāta* given by the donor through his (rice) spoon, is regarded as given through objects in contact with the donor's body and a bhikkhu who receives it with his bowl is also regarded as accepting it through an object in contact with his body and it is regarded as already offered. The same manner is observed when a lady offers and a bhikkhu receives with a piece of cloth held in his hand except when both parties are far apart, this being regarded as out of *hatthapāsa*.

Āpatti in this training-rule is also *acittaka*. If a newly-ordained bhikkhu should eat carelessly edible things which have not been offered he cannot be immune from *pācittiya*.

There is the Exalted Buddha's permission in another place referring to a sick bhikkhu — when there is an emergency, such as a snakebite, there being no attendant (*kappiyakāraka*), a bhikkhu can take a fourfold medicine known by the name '*mahāvikaṭa*' made up of urine (*muttam*), excrement (*gūtham*), ashes and soil. A bhikkhu can take these medicines without being *āpatti*. According the *Atthakathā*, it is explained further that a bhikkhu who cuts wood and burns it into ashes, or digs the soil in order to obtain the desired kind, will not be *pācittiya* for the offences of cutting wood and digging the soil.



## V. ACELAKA-VAGGA

— the Section on Naked Ascetics, fifth.

### 1. The first sikkhāpada states :

Should any bhikkhu give harder foods or softer foods with his own hand to a naked ascetic or to a male or female wanderer, it entails expiation. (41)

An acelaka means a naked ascetic. A *paribbājaka* is a man ordained outside the Buddhasāsana, while a *paribbājikā* is a woman similarly ordained. A bhikkhu who gives edible things to any of them with his own hand is *pācittiya*. If he orders someone else to give to them, or he places it for them, or he gives inedible things, it is said that he is not *pācittiya*.

I understand that the manner of offering is also traditionally observed among these (groups) ordained outside (the Sāsana). One group would not eat things which had been formally received by other groups and each group wants those of other groups to offer them in the same way as things received from a householder. If a bhikkhu gives harder or softer food with his own hand, he will lower himself to the level of one who is not ordained for those ascetics and wanderers who will look down upon him. So the Exalted Buddha has laid down this training-rule forbidding bhikkhus to do this, and therefore if a bhikkhu orders others to give to them, or places it down for them, or gives other things which are not edible, it is said that he is not *āpatti*.

### 2. The second sikkhāpada states :

Should any bhikkhu say to a bhikkhu thus, "Come friend, let us go into the village or the town for alms" and then whether he has had anything given (to that bhikkhu) or not, should he dismiss him thus: "Go, friend, it is not convenient for me to talk or sit with you

(present), it is only convenient for me to talk or sit by myself", making that the reason and no other, it entails expiation. (42)

The Vibhanga explains that the speaker desires to speak teasingly and to play or to sit in a closed place with a woman, or he desires to do something which is against good conduct and so dismisses (the one accompanying him). If, having such desires in his mind, he dismisses the other in order to conceal his conduct, he is *pācittiya*. When there are other causes, such as, the other's bowl is already full and the speaker tells him to return, without intention to conceal his private misconduct, he is not *āpatti*.

### 3. The third *sikkhāpada* states :

Should any *bhikkhu* intrude upon and sit down with a family having food, it entails expiation. (43)

In this training-rule there is one term which should be discussed '*sabhojane*' being an adjective of the term '*kule*' (family). Perhaps the Vibhanga considered that it is a term of combination (*sandhi*), being *sa + ubhojane* which means 'having two people', the 'u' being elided. Therefore the Vibhanga explained accordingly that '*sabhojanasakula*' means having male and female being not separated from each other and being not without lust (*rāga*), and then explained that the place where they were sitting was the sleeping room. The original story also relates the same subject, that is to say, a *bhikkhu* goes and intrudes sitting down when those two are intimate together. Now the Atthakathā Teacher realizes that the understanding of term '*sa + ubhojane*' in the Vibhanga is wrong so he explained in another way, that is '*sa*' being followed by '*bhojana*' because a compound (*samāsa*) = *sabhojane*, meaning 'along with food' or 'having food' but he interprets the term '*bhojana*' as '*bhoga*' (wealth) and explained further that male and female are each regarded as the wealth of the other. This is hard to accept! It is no improvement upon the previous explanation!



I understand that the term is made up of 'sa' followed by 'bhojana' becoming the compound 'sabhojane', which means 'along with bhojana' or 'having bhojana'. There is no doubt that this is right and true but it does not have the meaning as explained in the Atthakathā.

There is no doubt that it is the literal meaning of this term that is true, that is to say, ( the people ) are taking a meal. A bhikkhu who had approached a family while they were taking the meal, would disgrace his etiquette, so that this training-rule would have been laid down to prevent a bhikkhu from such misbehaviour. I would like to place this matter before the Vinaya experts so that they may investigate it further.

#### **4. The fourth sikkhāpada states:**

Should any bhikkhu seat himself together with a woman on a screened seat, it entails expiation. ( 44 )

#### **5. The fifth sikkhāpada states :**

Should any bhikkhu seat himself together with a woman, one man and one woman privately, it entails expiation. ( 45 )

The two kinds of secluded places should be understood in the same way as stated in the two *Aniyata* training-rules. The posture of sitting here, covers also the posture of lying down but it does not cover those of standing and walking. By the first training-rule ( the fourth one above ) is meant 'sitting in a place out of sight' because there is no term 'one man and one woman', so it is held that if a bhikkhu sits in a room with many women there must be a male person who knows the sense ( of what is said ) present because women though many, cannot ensure a bhikkhu against āpatti. As a matter of fact, the phrase 'one man and one woman' could have been carelessly dropped from the very beginning or perhaps dropped at the time of memorizing, or again at the

time of copying manuscripts. This training-rule can be compared with the *First Aniyata Sikkhāpada* in which there is this term 'one man and one woman'. The Vibhaṅga did not mention this term at all so I understand that the term '*eko ekāya*' has been lost at a time after the Vibhaṅga's coming into existence.

By the second training-rule (the fifth one above) is meant 'a place out of hearing' and can be compared to the *Second Aniyata* training-rule. Because of the phrase 'one man and one woman' it leads to the understanding that if a bhikkhu sits in an open place with many women, those women can ensure a bhikkhu against āpatti. If the phrase 'one man and one woman' was certainly lost (in the fourth rule) then this explanation can be adopted also for the preceeding rule as well. If one party stands and the other sits, or both stand, then there is no āpatti for the bhikkhu. Further explanations should be understood as follows: A bhikkhu stands to receive almsfood and a woman stands to offer almsfood, or a woman sits (squats or kneels) to offer in a place far from others which can be called a place out of hearing and a bhikkhu in such an open place can do in this way (without āpatti). A bhikkhu who is in a screened place; or in an open place, himself with a woman privately, though either one should stand, is not actually āpatti but possibly damage arising from such āpatti would come about for that bhikkhu. Therefore a bhikkhu should not do this. A bhikkhu who knows how to guard his behaviour so that it is not a cause for doubt and disgust in others, is praised by the Exalted Buddha as *ācārasampanno*, which means, 'together with the possession of good behaviour' which goes along with the Pāṭimokkha restraint, both of which are given in the Niddesa of the Bhikkhu's precepts. (See: *Siluddesapāṭho* chanted after Pāṭimokkha). This should be taken as a good example.

It is said that a bhikkhu who has no intention to conceal himself; or who sits absent-mindedly thinking about something else, though he sits with a woman, is not āpatti. In the first case here, it should be understood thus: A bhikkhu sits in a room



with many women, having a male who understands ( the sense ) sitting there, but sometimes the latter may go outside, the bhikkhu being unable to stop him in time. This is called one who sits without intention to conceal himself. In the latter case, it should be understood thus: A bhikkhu is sitting alone thinking about something when a woman approaches him, without him being conscious of her.

#### **6. The sixth sikkhāpada states:**

Should any bhikkhu who has been invited for a meal go (before noon on the day of the meal) either before the meal or after it to visit ( other ) families without informing a bhikkhu who is present ( within the Boundary-Hall precincts, or within the boundary of that ārāma ), unless it is the proper occasion, it entails expiation. Herein the proper occasion in this: an occasion of giving robes, an occasion of making-up robes This is the proper occasion here. ( 46 )

According to the subject of the original story, it seemed to be held that the manner of accepting such an invitation is a cause forbidding a bhikkhu from going elsewhere before the meal and forbidding him to visit families after having such a meal, exceptions being made on two occasions mentioned in the training-rule together with two others: if he has to go to fetch medicine for a sick bhikkhu, or if he has taken leave of another bhikkhu. But the meaning of the matter in this training-rule is not as suggested above because there is the conditional term 'vā' = 'or' following the terms 'before meal' and 'after meal' therefore the acceptance of an invitation for a meal may be the main point with which we should be concerned here.

I understand that a bhikkhu who has accepted an invitation for a meal is forbidden to go somewhere else before that meal, that is to say, when he is going to take a meal, he is forbidden to stray here and there so as to prevent him from being late or from

being difficult to find. To forbid him from going to visit other places after a meal, means that when he returns from the inviter's house, he should not take the opportunity to wander here and there. When there is something necessary to be done (as mentioned in the training-rule) he should take leave of another bhikkhu (who will know where he has gone) as a formality. These two 'occasions', however, are usually the times for exceptions in other training-rules.

If on the way to the inviter's house, he has to pass by other houses, in that case he is not 'one who strays'. If there is no other bhikkhu, that is, he lives alone, he can go whenever there is something which should be done. Because in the training-rule, it mentions only going to visit families, therefore the Vibhaṅga explained that a bhikkhu who goes to other wats, to the bhikkhunis' dwellings, or to places of other religious, is not āpatti, but in a matter like this which sometimes brings about an unsatisfactory result it is usual to award a dukkaṭa. Here there will be an unsatisfactory result, so to explain that he is not āpatti here is inconsistent. A bhikkhu who calls on houses on the (direct) way back to his wat is not counted as wandering and this is allowed. If there are other bhikkhus, he must certainly take leave of them as this is laid down in another training-rule. There is no point for discussion regarding the way to the inviter's house.

## 7. The seventh sikkhāpada states:

When a bhikkhu is not sick, an invitation (to consent to being supported) with requisites for (a period of) four months can be accepted by him. If he should accept one for longer than that, unless it is a repetition of the invitation or a permanent invitation, it entails expiation.  
(47)

In common speech, the term '*paccaya*' is the word for robes, almsfood, dwellings and medicine (of bhikkhus) but here the



Vibhaṅga explains that it refers to medicine called '*gilāna-paccaya*'. The reason why the Vibhaṅga explained in this way is perhaps because of the phrase 'a bhikkhu who is not sick'. I prefer to understand this matter in a broader way. If a bhikkhu should ask for requisites from inviters who are not related, then it is said that he is not āpatti in the training-rules concerning the general *viññatti* (requesting) but there are no special conditions of allowance there. I understand that the Exalted Buddha allowed bhikkhus to ask for requisites from inviters by this training-rule but they can only do so within four months, thus causing them to know the limits. When the inviter repeats his invitation, a bhikkhu may ask again for a further four months. But if an inviter makes an invitation for an unlimited time then the bhikkhu can ask all the time. Why does the training-rule speak about a bhikkhu who is not ill? That term leads to the understanding that the Exalted Buddha allowed an ill bhikkhu to ask all the time. This is true for He has allowed a sick bhikkhu to ask for *piṇḍapāta*. In other training-rules He has allowed him to ask for medicine. In the original story of a previous training-rule a bhikkhu who is not ill can ask for materials for constructing his dwelling (*senāsana*) as stated in the sixth Saṅghādisesa, so why cannot a sick bhikkhu make a request? But an allowable request by a bhikkhu (who is not sick) in other training-rules is not found except for a *civara*.

The inviters, according to the method given by the Vibhaṅga are divided into four classes. Those making:

- i) an invitation with limited requisites,
- ii) an invitation for a limited time,
- iii) an invitation limited in both the above ways, and
- iv) an invitation unlimited in either way.

The first class refers to the kind of invitation limiting the things given, such as, robes, *piṇḍapāta*, oil or honey, or else limiting the number of things such as, a certain number of robes, a certain cost of *piṇḍapāta*. Since an inviter makes an invitation

limiting the number of requisites, a bhikkhu can ask for them within the limits but since the duration of time is not mentioned by the inviter, a bhikkhu should ask within four months.

The second class refers to an invitation limited in time to less than four months, or to more than four months. A bhikkhu should ask during that stated time and he is not bound by the limit of four months.

The third class should be understood as both the above explanations combined. The fourth class is shown for example, when an inviter says 'please let me know whatever you desire' or 'I invite you with the four requisites'—and so on. This is called an invitation unlimited in things and if an inviter does not mention the duration of time then it is called unlimited in time. In this case, a bhikkhu can ask for whatever he desires but he should ask for it within four months, according to this training-rule. If an inviter repeats his invitation, a bhikkhu can ask each time for four months. If an inviter makes an invitation 'for an unlimited time' ('for all your life' or 'for all my life', etc.) then a bhikkhu can ask for it at any time.

#### 8. The eighth sikkhāpada states:

Should any bhikkhu go to see an army in battle array, unless there is a suitable reason, it entails expiation. (48)

'*Senā*' means troops and in ancient times it included elephantry, cavalry, charioteers and infantry and although (the scope of this term) has changed to some extent, yet they are still called '*senā*'. The *senā* which have been dispatched (in battle array) means the soldiers fighting against an enemy whether in an offensive or defensive action. According to the original story, the reason mentioned in the training-rule is explained by saying that a bhikkhu's relative (in the array) is ill and he asks to see that bhikkhu. If a bhikkhu considers that other causes are reasonable and suitable (he can go) but his going should be for



(something) necessary and not for sight-seeing. If troops are dispatched passing by his dwelling (*ārāma*) or he goes in some direction and meets them, he is not *āpatti*. There is no question when danger arises, such as being taken captive and held as a prisoner.

#### **9. The ninth sikkhāpada states:**

It may be that a bhikkhu has some reason for going to (visit) an army. Then that bhikkhu can stay with the army for two or three nights. If he should stay longer than that, it entails expiation. (49)

The reason here should be understood as stated in the previous training-rule. The method of counting the nights is measured according to the setting of the sun. *Āpatti* comes to a bhikkhu at the fourth day when the sun has set. If a bhikkhu stays for only three days and then returns, later he can go again. If there is a necessary cause, such as when he is ill in the army, or the troops he is with are surrounded by the enemy, or there are some other obstacles, then he can stay longer than that.

#### **10. The tenth sikkhāpada states:**

If while the bhikkhu is staying two or three nights with the army, he should go to a battle-field or to a camp or to a battle-array or to a regimental review, it entails expiation. (50)

### **VI. SURĀPĀNA-VAGGA**

—the Section on Drinking liquor, sixth.

#### **1. The first sikkhāpada states:**

In drinking distilled and fermented liquors there is (a case entailing) expiation. (51)

Here one should understand the explanation thus: All kinds of water either naturally having a sweet taste, such as palmyra (-palm) juice, or (sweetened drinks) mixed by people, when they have been kept over-long, become alcoholic, weak or strong according to the strength of the sugar and they are then called '*meraya*'—that which is prepared by fermentation. When that *meraya* is distilled so that the water is vapourized to make the strength of alcohol greater according to the degree desired by people, this is called '*surā*' (lit: that which is strong). Both together are called '*majja*' which means liquor making the drinker intoxicated. In short, it is all called intoxicating liquor. But in this training-rule, it is distinguished according to the kind, not as in other places (where only a general term is used). It is said that *āpatti* in this training-rule is *acittaka* because there is no term pointing out intention unlike the training-rules of *sāmaṇeras* and householders. A bhikkhu though he thinks that it is not intoxicating liquor and drinks it, is *āpatti*. Drinks which are not intoxicants but which have colour, smell and taste like intoxicating liquors such as some kinds of fermented medicines, are not the base of *āpatti*. A small quantity of intoxicating liquor which is mixed in curry, meat or in other foods for flavouring or for preventing decay and which is not a cause for intoxication, is regarded as *abbohārika* (insignificant). If a bhikkhu eats or drinks such things, he is not *āpatti*.

## 2. The second sikkhāpada states:

In tickling with the fingers there is (a case entailing) expiation. (52)

The Vibhaṅga explains that a bhikkhu is the base of *pācittiya*, anupasampanna is the base of *dukkata* but the training-rule neither says the one nor the other and does not state clearly. Due to the word 'fingers' it is said that a bhikkhu who pokes another with something in contact with his body, is *dukkata*. If it is already accepted that a thing in contact with the body is the



base of dukkaṭa, then if a bhikkhu pokes a person (on the portion of his body) covered by cloth, he is also dukkaṭa. A bhikkhu having no intention to make another laugh and who has some reason for touching, is not āpatti.

### 3. The third sikkhāpada states:

In the dhamma (of sporting) with laughter in the water there is (a case entailing) expiation. (53)

The term 'dhamma' of laughing in the water means playing in the water. The Vibhaṅga holds that water from the ankles up is the base of pācittiya but it is not consistent with the described efforts (in the Vibhaṅga) made by a bhikkhu diving, surfacing and swimming in the water because in water from the ankles up, some will not be deep enough and no one can do these things! I prefer to understand that the water is deep enough for a bhikkhu to dip in, submerging himself completely, and deep enough for him to swim conveniently. Such is the base of pācittiya. Further, it is said that to play upon a boat is the base of dukkaṭa. If it is emphasized that to play upon a boat is a kind of playing in the water, then it is rather so but this is better regarded as behaviour which should be prevented. If the āpatti should be awarded (in this case of boatplaying), according to this training-rule there would seem to be no reason for objection (why it should not be so). Again, it said that a bhikkhu who splashes water with his hands or with his feet, or strikes the water with a stick, or throws a plate playfully on the water, is dukkaṭa. What has been said (by the Vibhaṅga) is correct. The shallow water here which does not reach the base of pācittiya or water in a vessel is the base of dukkaṭa. A bhikkhu who has no intention to play in the water but who takes a bath normally, can submerge himself to get the whole body wet, or a bhikkhu who has some work to do in the water can dip and swim as necessary. When there is danger such as a boat turned upside down or when a bhikkhu wants to help a person who is drowning, no question arises.

#### 4. The fourth sikkhāpada states:

In disrespect there is (a case entailing) expiation. (54)

The Vibhaṅga explains 'disrespect' as of two sorts: disrespect regarding persons, and disrespect regarding Dhamma. The former means disrespect to the person who exhorts or instructs bhikkhus. The latter means disrespect to the *Paññatti* (discipline being laid down directly by the Buddha) and to Dhamma which is not *paññatti*. When an *upasampanna* has warned him (who shows disrespect) about *Paññatti* or Vinaya and if he shows disrespect to either person or *paññatti*, he is *pācittiya*. It is said that if he is warned regarding matters other than *paññatti* by someone, including *upasampanna*, then (the wrong doer) is *dukkata*. And it is said that *anupasampanna* is the base of *dukkata*. This may refer to a *sāmaṇera* (as a warner) but the Vibhaṅga should not speak about this here. A bhikkhu who points out the reasons for his own behaviour, saying that he had been taught in that way by his Ācariya, is not *āpatti*.

This training-rule has been laid down to prevent a bhikkhu from stubborn and self-willed behaviour. When he is instructed or warned, he should show respect and choose what is right. He should not look down upon the speakers or upon the matter spoken about. Behaviour such as this is good, it is called beautiful.

#### 5. The fifth sikkhāpada states:

Should any bhikkhu frighten a bhikkhu it entails expiation. (55)

The manner of frightening is thus: to speak or to behave in ways so that another bhikkhu becomes afraid and is frightened of ghosts, threatening him with fear of robbers, or of wild beasts,—all are included here. Whether the one who may be frightened is afraid or not, is not the question. A bhikkhu who frightens *upasampanna* is *pācittiya* and if he does this to an



*anupasampanna*, he is *dukkata*. If he does not intend to frighten him but narrates to him about demons, informs him of the news about robbers and wild beasts, he is not *āpatti*.

**6. The sixth sikkhāpada states:**

Should any *bhikkhu* who is not sick light a fire or have a fire lighted expecting to be warmed by it, unless there is a suitable reason, it entails expiation. (56)

The term 'one who is not sick' means one who can live happily without needing to be warmed by fire. The term 'unless there is a suitable reason' refers to other reasons for lighting a fire beside needing one for warmth. For example, to light a fire for light in the night-time, for boiling water, and so on. In other places (in the *Vinaya*), the Exalted One allowed a fire-house for heating the body, as used in Siam in ancient times. In such a fire-house, charcoal was used as fuel and either a sick *bhikkhu* or one who is well can warm himself but the present training-rule forbids (healthy) *bhikkhus* from warming themselves, so that there is a contradiction. Therefore, it is explained that to light a fire which has flames is forbidden but to light a charcoal fire is allowed.

I understand that to forbid a *bhikkhu* from warming himself in this training-rule, is to prevent a *kuṭi* made of wood and thatched with grass from being burnt by fire. So the Exalted Buddha allowed a *bhikkhu* to warm himself in a place for that purpose, called a fire-house, thus preventing such a danger. This leads to the assumption that a *bhikkhu* who warms himself in a fire-house is not *āpatti* but one who does so in other places is *āpatti*, excepting a sick *bhikkhu* who is unable to dispense with warming his body. To light a fire for other purposes is indeed necessary and those who do so are excepted from *āpatti*.

**7. The seventh sikkhāpada states:**

Should any *bhikkhu* bathe at intervals of less than a fortnight, unless it is the proper occasion, it entails expi-

ation. Herein the proper occasion is this: The month and a half of the Remainder of the Hot Season with the first month of the Rainy Season, making two and a half months, are the occasion of hot weather; (the other occasions are) an occasion of fever, an occasion of sickness, an occasion of ( physical ) work, an occasion of going on a journey, an occasion of a storm. This is the proper occasion here. (57)

It is said that this training-rule was laid down for a fixed region (*desa-paññatti*), that is to say, it is fixed for the Middle Country—the central provinces of India. According to the original story the reason causing the Exalted One to lay down this training-rule is stated to be as follows: King Bimbisāra who ruled over Magadha state went to wash his head at Tapodā. At that time a group of bhikkhus engaged in bathing until the dark (thus preventing the King from batheing and then entering his city). But elsewhere (in the Vinaya) He has allowed bhikkhus to bathe often in the *Paccantajanapada* outside the Middle Country. According to the traditions of those people who lived there, not taking a bath was regarded as dirty. The story of forbidding bhikkhus to bathe is queer, although it does not concern us directly as we live in a country where bathing is allowed, yet we should ponder over the cause for it. According to the brahmin tradition, they take a bath three times a day, while bhikkhus have one only once a fortnight. How dirty they will become! I understand that this training-rule was laid down specifically for a country where there was shortage of water and for the time of drought, for example upon high land during drought.

#### 8. The eighth sikkhāpada states:

When a bhikkhu has acquired a new cloth, one of the three kinds of discolouring must be applied by him, that is, green or mud or dark brown. If he should use a new cloth without applying one of the kinds of discolouring, it entails expiation. (58)



The aim of this training-rule as stated in the original story and then in the training-rule itself, is in contradiction. In the original story it seems that the Exalted Buddha instructed the bhikkhus to mark (robes), so that the marker may remember which is his own (robe), but in the training-rule itself the emphasis is upon discolouration in accordance with *lūkha-paṭipatti*—the practice of using plain things. According to the phrase “discolouring must be applied by him, that is, green, mud or dark brown”, the Atthakathā teaches that one should mark in a round shape—about as big as the ‘eye’ of the peacock (upon its tail-feathers) and about as small as the body of a bed-bug, which is called *bindu-kappaṇi* meaning ‘to make a round spot’. This way of teaching a bhikkhu to make a round spot is similar to ways of marking (instead of signing the name) used by illiterates. At that time bhikkhus also were not skilled at writing letters.

A bhikkhu who has obtained a new robe should mark it first and then use it. When the mark has been made, if it disappears (in washing, etc.) there is no need for a bhikkhu to mark it again. If another piece of cloth is patched on to the old cloth on which a mark has already been made, the bhikkhu need not make the mark on the new patch. Since the training-rule does not state clearly, a bhikkhu can make only a round spot. If he wants to discolour the robe he can take any of the three colours and paint them on it. If he decides to make a mark for identification, he may write some letters (of his name, etc) upon it. In order to combine these two ways, (of marking or of discolouring) a bhikkhu may (write some letters to discolour). This matter is usually regarded just as a ceremonial observance and nobody has tried to find out the reasonable meaning, since they have practised only the way of marking taught by the Atthakathā.

#### 9. The ninth sikkhāpada states:

Should any bhikkhu, having shared (vikap) an (extra) robe of his own with a bhikkhu or with a bhikkhuni or

with a female probationer or with a male novice or with a female novice, make use of it without (the other) relinquishing (his share), it entails expiation. (59)

The *sāmaṇeri* (female novice) is an ordinary woman under the age of twenty who has received the *Pabbajjā* in the presence of a *bhikkhuni* and who practises the ten training-rules just as a *sāmaṇera*. *Sikkhamānā* is that very *sāmaṇeri* whose age has reached eighteen, having only two years before reaching the requirement for *upasampadā*. The *bhikkhuni*-sangha announces a motion to give her *sikkhā-sammatti* that is, the sangha's consent for her to practise six training-rules from *pāṇātipātā*.... to *vikālabhojanā veramaṇi* without breaking any of them for two full years. If she breaks any of them, she has to re-accept them and begin again that (probationary) period of two years. If she can practise them without breaking them for a full two years, the *bhikkhuni*-sangha then was able to announce a motion for her *upasampadā*. This *sikkhamānā* is placed under the *bhikkhuni* but is higher than the *sāmaṇeri*.

'Vikap' really means to make having two owners. There are two methods of doing this; to *vikap* in the presence of, and to do so in the absence of. The former means to *vikap* it in the presence of the receiver saying as follows: IMAM CĪVARAM TUIYHAM VIKAPPEMI which means "I share this *civara* with you". If there are many robes the words IMĀNI CĪVARĀNI (these *civaras*) are used instead of IMAM CĪVARAM. If the *civara* is placed outside *hatthapāsa*, the term ETAM (singular, that) and ETĀNI (plural, those) are used in place of IMAM and IMĀNI (this, these). The *vikap* in the absence of means to share *civara* with a certain *sahadhammika* who is not present, but in the presence of another the words to be uttered are: IMAM CĪVARAM ITTHANĀMASSA VIKAPPEMI which means "I share this *civara* with one of a certain name". If he shares with a *bhikkhu* whose name is, say, *Uttara* he has to mention his name saying UTTARASSA BHIKKHUNO or



AYASMATO UTTARASSA instead of ITTHANĀMASSA, according to whether the receiver is younger or older (in Rains) than himself. But the Vibhaṅga says that the latter kind of vikaṇḍa is also regarded as 'vikaṇḍa in the presence of'! The way in which the Vibhaṅga has explained 'vikaṇḍa in the absence of' is very difficult to understand. The explanation there seems to involve asking a second bhikkhu to help the first one to vikaṇḍa with a third bhikkhu but the Vibhaṅga's explanation is just 'speak go, speak come' (i.e. long-winded words) for this means there is no way round 'vikaṇḍa in the presence of'. That is, the first and second bhikkhus can complete the procedure of vikaṇḍa between themselves and the third bhikkhu does not know, nor does he see.

The cīvara which has already been shared cannot be used according to this training-rule, as long as the receiver does not relinquish his share. When he does so, the cīvara can be used. The words for relinquishing are as follows: IMAM CĪVARAM MAYHAM SANTAKAM PARIBHUṆJA VĀ VISAJJEHI VĀ YATHĀPACCAYAM VĀ KAROHI. If the relinquishing bhikkhu is younger (in Rains) than the other, these words should be used: IMAM CĪVARAM MAYHAM SANTAKAM PARIBHUṆJATHA VĀ VISAJJETHA VĀ YATHĀPACCAYAM VĀ KAROTHA. The meaning in either case is the same but in the latter case the words show respect. They mean: "You may use, give up or do whatever you like with this cīvara belonging to me". The words for relinquishing 'in the absence of' may not exist.

Regarding the subject of *vikappa*, the opinions of the Ācariyas differ, for some understand that the cīvara which has been relinquished after vikaṇḍa becomes an extra robe again, some understand that it is still *vikappita-cīvara*, (that is, a robe in the condition of dual ownership). The former who hold that it becomes an extra-robe not to be kept beyond ten days, have for ever to be making 'vikaṇḍa', while the latter who hold that it

becomes *vikappita-cīvara* make *vikap* only once and do not *vikap* again. Considering the terms in the training-rule, the term 'not relinquishing' seems to mean 'not relinquish from *vikap*'. Regarding the terms for relinquishing, the Vibhaṅga composed the statement for relinquishing 'in the absence of' as follows: TESAM SANTAKAM PARIBHUÑJA VĀ...etc, which means "You may use *cīvaras* belonging to them ...." etc. It seems to me that those *bhikkhus* (the receivers) are still owners. The statement for relinquishing 'in the presence of' which has been composed similarly does not give up the ownership either. It should be understood that to *vikap* is also *vinayakamma*, practising according to the tradition but it does not emphasize the actual meaning. When the terms are examined literally, it leads to different opinions. When we consider its meaning, the *vikap* is for dual ownership. The term 'relinquishing' seems at first to mean: to relinquish from ownership, and the *cīvara* truly becomes *atireka-cīvara*, but when the two owners still understand that that *cīvara* has already been 'vikapped', the words for relinquishing seem to be the terms for allowance to use it, etc, and these terms cannot do away with it being common property. According to the above understanding, it may be assumed that if the receiver relinquishes his ownership, the *vikapped cīvara* again becomes an *atireka-cīvara*; but if the receiver only allows his partner to use it, etc, that *cīvara* still remains a *vikappita-cīvara*. Perhaps there may be a question asked: If the receiver does not give up his ownership, does that *cīvara* remain unrelinquished (*apaccutthakam*)? The question is correct. Even then, to use a *cīvara* allowed by one receiving the *vikappa*, can be regarded as using it having trust (*vissāsa*) and the user is not *āpatti*.

#### 10. The tenth *sikkhāpada* states:

Should any *bhikkhu* hide or have hidden (another) *bhikkhu*'s bowl or cloth or sitting-mat or needle-case or waist-band even for a joke, it entails expiation. (60)



Since the training-rule mentions the requisites clearly, a bhikkhu who hides requisites other than these is dukkaṭa. Hiding the requisites of an *anupasampanna*, a bhikkhu is only dukkaṭa. Having no intention to joke, a bhikkhu who has seen things kept improperly and who helps by putting them away, is not āpatti.

## VII. SAPĀṆA-VAGGA

— the Section on Living beings, seventh.

### 1. The first sikkhāpada states:

Should any bhikkhu purposely deprive a living being of life it entails expiation. (61)

In the training-rule, 'living beings' are in Pāli, 'pāṇo' meaning matter having breath and being alive. Here it refers to animals of large and small kinds which equally are the base of *pācittiya*. In the classification of offences under the third *pārājika*, it does not say that to deprive an animal of life is the base of dukkaṭa since this training-rule has been specifically laid down.

### 2. The second sikkhāpada states:

Should any bhikkhu knowingly use (*paribhoga*) water containing living beings it entails expiation. (62)

Drinking, taking a bath or using water in other ways are included under the term '*paribhoga*'.

### 3. The third sikkhāpada states:

Should any bhikkhu knowing that a legal process has been disposed of according to what is righteous, agitate for it to be carried out again, it entails expiation. (63)

The matters which have arisen and should be disposed of are called *adhikaraṇa* or legal processes. They are classified into four sections: *vivādādhikaraṇa*, the *vivāda* or dispute regarding

subjects of Dhamma and Vinaya. It should be judged whether right or wrong. *Anuvāḍādhikaraṇa*—when one or more bhikkhus accuse another of āpatti. This has to be disposed of by a decision as to whether it is true or not. *Āpattādhikaraṇa*—when a bhikkhu is āpatti this legal process has to be carried out to clear him. *Kiccādhikaraṇa*—a duty to be carried out by the sangha such as upasampadā. This has to be carried out completely. When any of these *adhikaraṇa* has arisen and when the sangha or an individual has carried them out completely and perfectly, that is, they are carried out according to the cause or according to the rule, should any bhikkhu knowing this, thinking himself independent, agitate for that to be done again, he is pācittiya—except he understands that the matter which has already been disposed of is not correct according to what is righteous.

#### 4. The fourth sikkhāpada states:

Should any bhikkhu knowingly conceal a bhikkhu's gross fault, it entails expiation. (64)

The gross fault is explained by the Vibhaṅga as the four pārājika and the thirteen sanghādisesa but in the Atthakathā, only sanghādisesa is given. The term 'bhikkhussa' (of a bhikkhu) means all who declare themselves bhikkhus. If the understanding is narrowed to sanghādisesa alone, then suppose a bhikkhu knows that a bhikkhu who is his friend had become pārājika but still declares himself a bhikkhu, the first one would not then be very careful of Dhamma-Vinaya since he concealed this matter. What penalty should be given to him for his offence?

I see that the āpatti in this training-rule should be given to him. According to the eighth sanghādisesa on the subject of accusing a bhikkhu of a baseless pārājika, the Vibhaṅga there explains that if a bhikkhu is not pure, that is, he is pārājika, but the accuser understands that he is pure, and accuses him with



another baseless *pārājika*, (the accuser) is *sanghādisesa*. This is an example which should be compared with the present matter: the term 'of a *bhikkhu*' means all who declare themselves as *bhikkhus*. A *bhikkhu* who does not intend to conceal (another's fault) because there is no reason to do so, not telling anyone, is not *āpatti*. If he realizes that to speak words informing others will be worse than keeping silent and so does not speak, the *Vibhaṅga* allows him to do so. When his intention is examined, he is not regarded as concealing, because he hopes thus to prevent some bad results.

#### 5. The fifth *sikkhāpada* states:

Should any *bhikkhu* knowingly give the Full Acceptance (as a *bhikkhu*) to a person under twenty years of age, then that person is not fully accepted and those *bhikkhus* (who took part in the ceremony) are censurable; for the *bhikkhu* (who gave the Full Acceptance), this entails expiation. (65)

The explanations are as follows: *bhikkhus* knowingly enter an assembly as a *sangha*, give the full acceptance (*upasampadā*) to a person under twenty years of age and among them the *upajjhāya* is *pācittiya* and the rest are *dukkata*. A person who gained *upasampadā* in this way is not a *bhikkhu*. It is held that he is only *sāmaṇera*.

#### 6. The sixth *sikkhāpada* states:

Should any *bhikkhu* knowingly and by appointment set out to travel on the same journey with a caravan of thieves even to go through one village, it entails expiation. (66)

The caravan of those who are thieves, is made up of traders smuggling prohibited goods, such as at present the smuggling of opium, or else they conceal taxable commodities. The *Vibhaṅga* explained further to include robbers who have either

just plundered or who have not done so (recently). This explanation is correct because if a bhikkhu sets out to travel together with them, he cannot avoid being implicated in some fault.

The length of one village is determined by the distance flown by a cock, but in crowded areas it should be determined according to any existing marks, for instance, according to the breadth of land owned by a man and so on. In the forest where there are no houses, the Vibhaṅga determined the half-yojana as the boundary. A bhikkhu who does not make an appointment but both parties set out simultaneously and in the same direction, is not āpatti.

#### **7. The seventh sikkhāpada states:**

Should any bhikkhu by appointment set out to travel on the same journey with a woman even to go through one village, it entails expiation. (67)

'*Mātugāma*' here was explained as 'human female who knows the sense'. In this training-rule, there is no term '*jānam*' – knowingly, so either it was not there from the beginning or else it has been lost, but I am not sure about this. Because of the absence of this term, it is explained that āpatti here is *acittaka*. The remaining explanation should be understood as in the previous training-rule.

#### **8. The eighth sikkhāpada states:**

Should any bhikkhu say thus "I understand Dhamma taught by the Exalted One to be such that those things said by the Exalted One to be obstructions are not in fact obstructions for him who indulges in them"; then that bhikkhu should be admonished by bhikkhus thus: "Let the venerable one not say thus, do not misrepresent the Exalted One; for misrepresentation of the Exalted



One is not good, and the Exalted One would not say thus. Obstructive things, friend, have been said by the Exalted One in many ways to be obstructions. Enough of your indulging in obstructive things". Should that bhikkhu, being admonished by bhikkhus thus, endeavour as before, then that bhikkhu should be remonstrated with by bhikkhus (that is, the announcement in the Sangha to stop a bhikkhu from such action) up to the third time so that he may relinquish (his endeavour). If on being remonstrated with up to the third time he relinquishes (his endeavour) that is good; if he should not relinquish it, it entails expiation. (68)

#### 9. The ninth sikkhāpada states:

Should any bhikkhu knowingly eat together with or live together with or sleep together with a bhikkhu who says thus, whose case has not been settled according to Dhamma, and who has not relinquished that view, it entails expiation. (69)

'Eating together' means association and the Vibhaṅga classified it into two: association through material things—that is, to give or to receive reciprocally, being called *āmisasamabhoga*; and association through learning Dhamma—that is, instructing that bhikkhu in Dhamma, or asking such a bhikkhu to teach Dhamma, being called *Dhammasamabhoga*. 'Living together' means entering an assembly to make Uposatha for Pāṭimokkha, Pavāraṇā-assembly, or some Sanghakamma with such a bhikkhu. 'Sleeping together' means stretching the body together with him under the same roof. Each of these is the base of pācittiya.

The explanation of these two training-rules is thus: If there is an arrogant bhikkhu who opposes Dhamma and Vinaya, making turmoil in the sangha, it is the duty of all bhikkhus to warn him to give up that view. First of all gentle methods should be adopted, that is, to instruct him, give advice and warn

him. If he stubbornly endeavours as before, there is the Exalted One's allowance for the sangha to announce (a motion) prohibiting him (from doing so) by the power of the sangha. If he does not listen to it, he is regarded as one whose association within the sangha is suspended. This is called *ukkhittaka* and other bhikkhus cannot eat, sleep or associate with him. A *pācittiya* comes to a bhikkhu who does so. But suspension like this is temporary. If a guilty bhikkhu who cannot associate with others then behaves properly, giving up his former views, the sangha will announce a motion to remove his penalty and allow him to associate with other bhikkhus. The latter training-rule forbids association with a suspended bhikkhu as long as he stubbornly makes endeavour with his view.

#### 10. The tenth sikkhāpada states:

If a *sāmaṇera* should say thus "I understand Dhamma taught by the Exalted One to be such that those things said by the Exalted One to be obstructions are not in fact obstructions for him who indulges in them"; then that *sāmaṇera* should be admonished by bhikkhus thus: "Friend novice, do not say thus, do not misrepresent the Exalted One; for misrepresentation of Exalted One is not good, and the Exalted One would not say thus. Obstructive things, friend novice, have been said by the Exalted One in many ways to be obstructions. Enough of your indulging in obstructive things." Should that *sāmaṇera*, being admonished by bhikkhus thus, endeavour as before, he should then be admonished thus: "Friend novice, from today onwards neither can the Exalted One be claimed by you as your teacher nor is (the privilege of) sleeping together (under the same roof) with bhikkhus for two or three nights which other *sāmaṇeras* have, any longer yours. Get you gone, you evil man, be off!". Should any bhikkhu knowingly speak to a *sāmaṇera* thus expelled



or be looked after by him or eat together with him or sleep together (under the same roof) with him, it entails expiation. (70)

The explanation is connected with the foregoing in that if a *Samañuddesa* or *sāmañera* opposes the Dhamma-Vinaya in that way and he no longer listens to bhikkhus, they, being unable to announce a motion expelling him from association (because he is not a bhikkhu), may use this allowance to get him out. The Exalted Buddha forbade bhikkhus to look after him and a *pācittiya* comes to a bhikkhu who makes endeavour in this.

### VIII. SAHADHAMMIKA-VAGGA

— the Section on According with Dhamma, eighth.

#### 1. The first sikkhāpada states:

Should any bhikkhu, being admonished according to Dhamma by bhikkhus (about a training-rule), say thus, "Friends, I shall not observe this training-rule until I can ask some other bhikkhu who is a learned expert in the Vinaya about it," it entails expiation. Bhikkhus, when a bhikkhu is training he should thoroughly understand, ask and inquire about (it). This is the proper course here. (71)

There (being admonishment according to a) training-rule firstly, and the admonisher being a bhikkhu secondly, these two factors combined together are the base of *pācittiya* (for a guilty bhikkhu). There being dhammas which are not training-rules firstly, or the admonisher being *anupasampanna*, these two factors are the base of *dukkaṭa*.

#### 2. The second sikkhāpada states:

Should any bhikkhu when the *Pāṭimokkha* is recited say thus: "Why are these lesser and minor training-rules

recited? They only lead to worry, bother and confusion". In disparaging the training-rules there is (a case entailing) expiation. (72)

A bhikkhu who does not intend to disparage training-rules and who speaks about them for some reason with which he is concerned, is not āpatti.

### 3. The third sikkhāpada states:

Should any bhikkhu when the Pāṭimokkha is recited each fortnight say thus, "Only now do I understand; this case, it seems, is in the Suttavibhaṅga, included in the Suttavibhaṅga, and comes up for recitation each fortnight", and if other bhikkhus should know of that bhikkhu: "This bhikkhu has already sat while the Pāṭimokkha was recited (at least) two or three times, so why speak further!", then there is no excuse for that bhikkhu in (pleading) ignorance and whatever is the fault that he has committed it should be dealt with according to the particular rule, and furthermore negligence should be imputed to him (by an act of the Sangha) thus: "It is no gain for you, friend, it is ill-done, in that when the Pāṭimokkha is recited you do not heed well and give attention", and (if he acts thus again) when negligence has been imputed to him, it entails expiation. (73)

The explanation of this training-rule is thus: Any bhikkhu who has listened two or three times to Pāṭimokkha being recited on the Uposatha-day every fortnight, when the recitation has come to the training-rule which he has broken, he desires to excuse himself, pretending (innocence) by saying "only now have I heard that such and such dhamma is a forbidden action coming in the Pāṭimokkha". The rules here are called *sutta* because they are the main training-rules. Such a bhikkhu is āpatti according to the action done by him (the base), and he cannot escape from it by his pretence. Regarding his pretending, let a bhikkhu who



knows of this matter announce it in the sangha and add to the (existing) penalty (the penalty of this training-rule). When the announcement has been made, a guilty bhikkhu still endeavouring as before with his pretence is *pācittiya* according to this training-rule. The action of announcement raising the penalty because of his pretending, is called *mohāropana-kamma*. The sangha cannot give this *kamma* to a bhikkhu who has never listened to the full recitation of *Pāṭimokkha*, or who has listened to it for less than two or three times, or who has no intention to be negligent.

According to the foregoing explanation, one should realize that bhikkhus of those days understood clearly the meaning of the *Pāṭimokkha* when it was being recited (since Pāli was their spoken tongue). At present we cannot keep to this (practice of giving *mohāropana-kamma* since many bhikkhus do not know Pāli well).

#### 4. The fourth sikkhāpada states:

Should any bhikkhu, being angry and displeased, give a bhikkhu a blow, it entails expiation. (74)

#### 5. The fifth sikkhāpada states:

Should any bhikkhu, being angry and displeased, raise his hand against a bhikkhu, it entails expiation. (75)

Making a blow is done with the body, with things connected to the body, or by things thrown, all being regarded as giving a blow. A bhikkhu who does so to another bhikkhu is *pācittiya* because of the fourth training-rule here. Not only giving a blow but also threatening by raising the hand against a bhikkhu, is *pācittiya* according to the fifth rule above. The *Atthakathā* said that a bhikkhu who desires to disfigure another bhikkhu, cuts his ears or nose off and so is *dukkata*. This explanation has been made without careful consideration! The Commentator emphasized only the point of giving a blow or striking but causing

disfigurement is done by cutting or slashing. In fact, cutting, slashing or chopping requires a sharp weapon in the hand and is included in the case of making a blow with things connected to the body, while the suffering experienced by one who is so attacked is far worse than from a mere blow. How should a lighter penalty be given to him who does so? Furthermore, a bhikkhu who is angry thinks to do something which will cause fright, while he does not think to give an actual blow, but when he has raised his hand wrongly to make a blow and the limbs of another bhikkhu such as the hand become broken, then the Commentator says that he is only dukkaṭa—because he has no intention to give a blow! This was also said from the lack of careful consideration, since the Commentator has only emphasized here that it has gone beyond his intention. Only raising his hand is true to his intention and pācittiya according to the fifth training-rule can be given to him. When considering this action, a bhikkhu who is angry and gives a blow to another *upasampanna* is pācittiya according to the fourth rule and it is not necessary to ask which āpatti according to which training-rule should be given to him because the manner of completed action is actually a blow. *Anupasampanna* is the base of dukkaṭa. The Atthakathā said that animals are also included here. This is correct because one who shows cruelty to animals such as dogs and cats and so on, is giving up his restraint. The āpatti in the fourth rule should be *sāṇattika* referring to asking others to strike a blow. A bhikkhu who does so is also āpatti. The Atthakathā compared this training-rule with the first pārājika, but why does it do so? It is probably because this training-rule also refers to doing by oneself. But the Adinnādānā training-rule (second pārājika) also refers to doing by oneself, so why is āpatti here considered to be *sāṇattika*? This is because it is theft in equal degree. In the present training-rule, to ask others to do for oneself leads to the completion of making a blow, therefore it should rather be compared with the Adinnādānā-rule.



But the āpatti of the fifth training-rule here, from considering the usual manner of action should be *anāṇattika* because to raise one's hand while one is angry is naturally done by oneself. Suppose one asks another to make as though giving a blow to some third party, by saying conditionally, 'Do not actually give a blow but only make him frightened'-though this would be possible on some occasions, yet there would be the point of his anger to be examined. While he is angry, has he the idea to ask another? Moreover the Atthakathā speaks about the origin (*samutṭhāna*) of the fourth training-rule by comparing it with the first pārājika, leading to the understanding that the āpatti of the fourth training-rule are grouped under the heading of *sacittaka*. This contradicts the Vibhaṅga in which it is explained as *tika-pācittiya* (with the possibility of being āpatti on three counts), both training-rules here having nothing to say about *sacittaka*. The Vibhaṅga explained that one who is attacked by another and who desires to escape and gives a blow, or raises his hand, is not āpatti. This manner is now called defensive fighting. It is rightly said and the right way to do. If this matter is examined according to these training-rules, a bhikkhu is not āpatti because the anger and displeasure are not manifest at that time. It does not fulfill (the conditions for āpatti) in this training-rule. Giving a blow here, is done out of revenge but giving a blow defensively is only in order to defend oneself.

#### 6. The sixth sikkhāpada states :

Should any bhikkhu groundlessly accuse a bhikkhu of a case entailing Initial and Subsequent Meeting of the Sangha, it entails expiation. (76)

To accuse groundlessly a bhikkhu of a saṅghādisesa should have a thullaccaya penalty in accordance the groundless accusation to a pārājika (which has a saṅghādisesa, see Saṅghādisesa 8), but because this training-rule exists, a pācittiya falls upon such an accuser. The Vibhaṅga said that a bhikkhu who falsely

accuses an *upasampanna* of some other bad behaviour is not *saṅghādisesa* but *dukkata*. This matter seems to be right unless it is examined carefully, for *dukkata* is a smaller *āpatti* than *pācittiya*. If it is carefully examined, such a false accusation must be *musāvāda* in itself, (and hence *pācittiya*). One who speaks thoughtlessly telling a lie, not aiming to harm another, must be *pācittiya* so why then should one who accuses another falsely, thereby telling a lie, receive a weaker *āpatti*?

My idea is thus: Since there are other training-rules giving stronger *āpatti*, such classification of *āpatti* as quoted from the *Vibhaṅga* above, is impossible. A *pācittiya* must come to any *bhikkhu* in the case mentioned above according to the *Musāvāda* training-rule. Since this training-rule exists, the classification of *āpatti* in connection with the *saṅghādisesa* rule of groundless accusation of *pārājika*, (where the accusation is concerned with a lesser offence than *pārājika*), that such an accuser should be *thullaccaya* cannot stand (since this present rule states that he must be *pācittiya*).

## 7. The seventh *sikkhāpada* states:

Should any *bhikkhu* purposely provoke worry in a *bhikkhu* (thinking), "Thus he will be uncomfortable for a while", making that the reason and no other, it entails expiation. (77)

The term 'provoke worry' is explained in the *Vibhaṅga* by saying that it is concerned with training-rules. Some people are always worried about something or other, being classified therefore, with the group of *vitakkacarita* (discursive temperament). Such *bhikkhus* are approached by someone who speaks about matters against the training-rules which they are unable to understand, for example: 'At the time of your *upasampadā*, how do we know whether that *kamma* was complete in all the aspects of *sampatti*, for if there was a deficiency then you were not given the full *upasampadā*?' In this way, such a statement



will become the cause for those bhikkhus worrying. Then how much remorse (hot-heartedness) they will feel! A bhikkhu who is not restrained and likes to play a joke does not think of the worry his friends will suffer but collects such matters to tell them, and so is pācittiya according to this training-rule. One who does not provoke worry purposely but who is giving instruction with some reason, such as to another who was ordained round about the age (of 20 years) and who is then advised to be re-ordained in order to make it firm, and such-like cases, is not āpatti.

#### **8. The eighth sikkhāpada states:**

Should any bhikkhu stand eavesdropping upon bhikkhus who are wrangling, quarrelling and disputing (thinking), "I shall overhear what they are saying", making this the reason and no other, it entails expiation. (78)

When bhikkhus became estranged, quarrel and dispute, whether one takes part in it or not, it is forbidden to eavesdrop and to use what one has learnt for further dispute or for finding fault, or to use it as an instrument to bring about their separation so that one can become intimate with one of the parties. The world regards the manner of eavesdropping as the basest evil so that no one trusts a man who is employed as a spy to search out peoples' secrets. Though people continue to use a spy yet he is not regarded as a good man. The Master realizing the evil in this has laid down this training-rule for prevention. Although one has no intention to eavesdrop and by chance passes by a place where bhikkhus are talking and one knows that they are discussing a secret the subject of which is concealed from oneself, still it is taught that one should show oneself by clearing the throat or coughing, so that they will know of one's passing along that way. The phrase 'making this the reason and no other' leads to the assumption that to eavesdrop upon a matter which has no harm in it, is not forbidden. For example, bhikkhus are conversing about Dhamma-Vinaya or examining some legal process and another

bhikkhu who is not taking part in that meeting and sits in some corner and overhears it, is not āpatti. Or again, a bhikkhu has some duty of find out the truth regarding the misbehaviour of another bhikkhu and so eavesdrops upon him when the latter, say, is talking with a woman, the two of them alone. There is no āpatti in this case for the eavesdropper.

**9. The ninth sikkhāpada states:**

Should any bhikkhu after giving his proxy vote for lawful acts (of the Sangha) later engage in decrying that activity, it entails expiation. (79)

The explanation is thus: The kamma that should be carried out by the sangha must be accomplished in concord. Bhikkhus who dwell within their meeting-boundary, called a 'sīmā', have the privilege to participate in the sangha-assembly, or to give their proxy-vote, giving consent to accomplish that matter. If the sangha leaves out some bhikkhus and does not invite them to take part in that assembly or does not ask for their proxy-vote (*chanda*), it is called accomplishing kamma by a group—and that kamma is not properly done. This training-rule treats of such a bhikkhu who has given his proxy-vote for kamma accomplished according to what is righteous but who later learns of that the kamma carried out by the sangha which does not satisfy him and he engages in decrying it. If that kamma is done according to righteousness, he is pācittiya. It is said that āpatti is *sacittaka* but there is nothing to indicate this. If the kamma carried but by the sangha does not accord with what is righteous, a bhikkhu who engages in decrying it is not āpatti.

**10. The tenth sikkhāpada states:**

Should any bhikkhu not give his proxy vote and get up from his seat and depart while investigatory discussion is still proceeding in the Sangha, it entails expiation. (80)



The explanation continued from the previous training-rule is thus: A bhikkhu who has taken part in a sangha-assembly, when the sangha has not yet finished its business, decides to spoil that kamma and does not give his proxy vote, getting up from his seat silently and when he leaves the *hatthapāsa*, he is *pācittiya*. It is said that this *āpatti* is also *sacittaka* but there is also nothing to indicate this. A bhikkhu who sees that the Sangha is carrying out the kamma not in accordance with Dhamma, or realizes that a quarrel will take place, and then leaves the meeting, is not *āpatti*. One who does not intend to spoil the kamma but suffers because he should urinate or stool, and who has not time enough to give his proxy vote, leaving the meeting thinking to return; or who becomes ill and cannot sit longer, or who has some duty to attend upon a sick bhikkhu—it being time to give medicine to him, and who manages to give his proxy vote and leave the meeting, is also (in all cases) not *āpatti*.

#### 11. The eleventh sikkhāpada states :

Should any bhikkhu (after forming part) of a sangha in concord that has given a robe (to a bhikkhu), later engage in decrying that activity thus: "Bhikkhus appropriate the Sangha's gain according to their whims," it entails expiation. (81)

When gains accrue to the sangha but they are trivial, not enough to share among all, the tradition is as follows: If those things are food or medicine which cannot be kept for long these are shared in turn (from the seniormost downwards and taking account of whose turn comes upon the roster of bhikkhus for a share on this occasion). If those things can be kept for a long time, such as *civara*, they must be kept till they are sufficient to be shared once among all. Then they must be shared among them all. If in doing this there is some left over, or the gains are not sufficient to share once, the sangha should allot this matter to a bhikkhu (by *apalokana-kamma*, the act of allotment) who is assigned to carry out some sangha-activity such as dwelling-distributer (*senāsana-gāhāpaka*) or is a distributer of other

things, and so on. This training-rule is concerned with a sangha who allot a cīvara to a bhikkhu in this way. Since this training-rule speaks about cīvara, it is explained that a bhikkhu who, after forming part of the sangha in concord that allots other requisites, later engages in decrying that activity, is dukkaṭa. According to the meaning of this training-rule, the dative-case (*sampadāna-kāraka*) indicating one to whom a cīvara is given, may be lost. The Vibhaṅga explained that a bhikkhu who has been determined by the sangha (as distributor), is the base of pācittiya (should he be decried by another). A bhikkhu who has not been determined by the sangha and an *anupasampanna* are the base of dukkaṭa. That term in the dative case may be lost later then the composition of the Vibhaṅga.

## 12. The twelfth sikkhāpada states:

Should any bhikkhu knowingly cause to be given to a person any gift (lit. 'gain', such as cloths) which were to be given to the Sangha, it entails expiation. (82)

All explanation should be understood as stated in the training-rule dealing with taking the Sangha's gains by a bhikkhu for himself, the last sikkhāpada in *Pattavagga*, (*Nissaggiya Pacittiya* 30).

## IX. RATANA-VAGGA

### —The Section on Treasures, ninth.

## 1. The first sikkhāpada states:

Should any bhikkhu, not having permission beforehand, pass the (bedchamber) threshold of a head-anointed king while the king has still not made his exit (from the bedchamber) and while the (queen called the) Treasure has still not been conducted (from it), it entails expiation. (83)



The term 'of a head-anointed king' can be explained according to national traditions, as follows: human beings were divided into four groups—ksatriyas (noble warriors) who guarded the community; the brahmins who were the teachers; the vaisyas who were the traders; and the sudras who were the employees. The ksatriya and brahmins were regarded as noble clans. Each clan married among its own members, for instance, the ksatriyas chose only women from the ksatriya clan. Brahmins did the same. Neither of them married with the women of lower castes. The offspring through seven generations unmixed with other blood was regarded as the highest family among them. The ksatriyas may be compared to the Chao (the hereditary princes of different provinces of Siam in the old times), who have their own leader who is the reigning monarch of the land. When a ksatriya is ascending the throne there is a royal ceremony for anointing his head with water, or for his immersion in water, which is called the Sprinkling of the Head. When this ceremony has been performed for him, he is recognized as a full-fledged king. This training-rule speaks about a ksatriya-born king who has received the *Murdhābhiseka* (Head-sprinkling) in order to show that it does not concern the hereditary princes. And it should be understood that it does not concern merely the ksatriyas whose family for seven generations has been pure without mixture of blood. Even though there are ksatriyas who have just established their dynasties and have received the ceremony in some other ways, still they are regarded as kings in this training-rule.

Regarding the phrase "while the (queen called the) treasure has still not been conducted (from it)", the Pāli of this training-rule calls the queen by the name of '*ratana*' (treasure). The queen who is well suited to the king is one of the seven treasures of the Wheel-turning Emperor. The Pāli "*itthibaṇḍānamuttamaṃ*" which means "woman is the highest possession" also means woman is a *ratana* or treasure. In this training-rule there seems to be a term missing, that is, 'the royal chamber' so that Vibhaṅga suggests that it is the royal sleeping chamber and

further explains that a certain place where the sleeping things are arranged for the king even though surrounded by a curtain, is called the royal sleeping chamber.

If the third training-rule of the fifth section of Pācittiya only prohibits bhikkhus from intruding and sitting in a family where there are only husband and wife, then it is not necessary to lay down this training-rule again, therefore I am convinced that *that* training-rule concerns the prohibition to sit intrudingly when people are having a meal.

## 2. The second sikkhāpada states :

Should any bhikkhu pick up or cause to be picked up a treasure or what is reckoned as a treasure, unless it is in his own monastery or in his own dwelling, it entails expiation. But when a treasure or what is reckoned as a treasure has been picked up or caused to be picked up by a bhikkhu in his own monastery or in his own dwelling it should be kept (with the thought) ; “Whoever it belongs to will take it away”. This is proper course here. (84)

‘*Ratana*’ means silver, gold, jewels. ‘What is reckoned as a treasure’ means things which are really not treasures but artificial things such as ornaments plated with silver or gold or studded with semi-precious stones, and it includes also general possessions of people. If these things fall in other places outside the bhikkhus’ monastery or kuṭī, a bhikkhu is prohibited from taking it, even though he thinks it is a thing lost, or though he expects to return it to the owner because in that case a bhikkhu may have to compensate (one who claims it), or he may be suspected as a thief. A careless man thinks of it as a gain but it is dangerous for him. The conduct of people in the present day who find a lost thing is that they should hand it over to the police. A bhikkhu who breaks this training-rule is pācittiya. It is said in the Atthakathā, that if that thing is the base for nissaggiya, that bhikkhu is nissaggiya pācittiya. If that bhikkhu need not compensate (for that thing),



this judgement is correct. If he has to compensate, the āpatti of this training-rule must be given to him. If that thing fell within the wat or in a dwelling and a bhikkhu did not preserve it and it was lost then it would not be good for the reputation of all who lived there. They may well be suspected of being thieves, therefore the Exalted Buddha allowed the bhikkhus living there to preserve it for the owner. *Ratana* which are *anāmāsa*—things not to be touched by a bhikkhu, are specially allowed to be picked up by bhikkhus (for their preservation). If someone comes to claim saying that he is the owner, a bhikkhu should not give the preserved article to him easily, since he has to compensate (the true owner) also if he gives it to the wrong man. He should investigate him until he is sure that the claimant is the real owner. The Vibhaṅga suggests that a bhikkhu should recollect the appearance or marks upon that thing so that if someone comes to inquire about it the bhikkhu should investigate him. If he can tell the correct appearance or marks upon it, then the bhikkhu should give it to him. If he tells them wrongly then the bhikkhu should tell him, "You should find out about this by yourself." When that bhikkhu departs from that wat, he should hand that article to a suitable bhikkhu. If there is no suitable bhikkhu, he should hand it over to a suitable householder. This suggestion in the Vibhaṅga about his departure is correct and the proper course of conduct. A bhikkhu who does not pick up things fallen in his wat or kuṭi is regarded as ignoring the duties which must be done (*kiccavatta*), and an āpatti of dukkaṭa comes to him.

In this training-rule, the Commentary-teachers include the keeping of things for a householder and explain elaborately according to the subject of this training-rule. Keeping things for a householder sometimes brings ill-repute to a bhikkhu and certainly it is different from picking up fallen things and so cannot be included in this training-rule.

### 3. The third sikkhāpada states:

Should any bhikkhu enter a village outside the proper time without taking leave of a bhikkhu who is present

(within the Boundary Hall precincts, or within the boundary of that wat), unless there is something to be done quickly, it entails expiation. (85)

The *vikāla* in this training-rule seems to mean night-time because the 6th training-rule of *Cārittavagga* (*Acelakavagga*) refers to the afternoon as *pacchābhatta* (after food) therefore, this training-rule is to prohibit roaming about at night but the Vibhaṅga explained that *vikāla* means from noon to the next dawn in the same way as the rule prohibiting eating food in the *vikāla* (*Bhojanavagga*). An example of a duty to be done quickly is given thus: a bhikkhu has been bitten by a snake. Even though there are other emergencies such as an ill bhikkhu who may die soon, a bhikkhu going quickly to find medicine or call for a doctor, a fire broken out near to the wat and a bhikkhu going to fetch people to help him guard against fire: these can be included in the duty to be done quickly. If a bhikkhu lives alone and there are no other bhikkhus in his wat, he can go. If he enters the village/town during the (allowable) time, he does not need to take leave according to this training-rule. If he enters the village outside the (allowable) time but he has taken leave, or he has done so because of the duty to be done quickly, he is not *āpatti*. A bhikkhu walks along the road passing by a village (through a town) and does not call on anyone, going directly to another wat, he is not prohibited (by this rule).

#### 4. The fourth sikkhāpada states:

Should any bhikkhu have a needle-case made of bone or ivory or horn, it entails expiation with breaking up. (86)

According to the original story, there was a fashion for needle-cases amongst bhikkhus so the Exalted Buddha has laid down this rule to prevent them bothering workers of lathes. Therefore this training-rule applies to one specific subject. A bhikkhu who himself asks (a lathesman) to make a needle-case (of these materials) is *pācittiya*. First he has to break the case and



then confess the āpatti. This kind of pācittiya is called *bhedanaka-pācittiya*, there being only one training-rule of this sort. If a bhikkhu uses needle-cases made by others (of such materials) he is dukkaṭa. Since this training-rule mentions only needle-cases, other things such as buttons and the small tags for joining together the edges of the cīvara at the time of putting it on, for a tinderbox, ointment-jar, spatula for applying the ointment and other such things are allowed. But it should be understood that if they are made at the time when they are fashionable, they would accord with the original story and the bhikkhu would seem not to be immune from dukkaṭa.

#### 5. The fifth sikkhāpada states:

When a bhikkhu is having a new bed or stool made it must be made with legs eight fingers of the sugata-finger high excepting the frame below; for one exceeding that there is (a case entailing) expiation with cutting down. (87)

The bed is a thing which is made long enough to lie down upon. The stool is a thing which is made shorter and not long enough to lie on but is used as a seat. A bhikkhu makes it by himself or asks others to make it exceeding the limit, he is pācittiya. He has first to cut the excessively long legs off the bed (etc.) and then confess his āpatti. These kinds of āpatti are called *chedanaka-pācittiya* and there are many such training-rules but the rest deal only with cloth. A bhikkhu uses, sits or lies down on a bed or stool which have been made by another (exceeding the limit) and he is dukkaṭa. They are allowable when their legs are cut down to the limit. The square stool which is large enough to sit upon is called *āsandi* while a stool having three raised sides comparable to an armchair is called *sattāṅga*—both are allowed in another section. A stool having a raised back comparable to a chair without arms is called *pañcāṅga* and is included with the *sattāṅga* above and though they have legs higher than the limit, they can be used.

**6. The sixth sikkhāpada states :**

Should any bhikkhu have a bed or stool upholstered with kapok it entails expiation with stripping (of the bed or chair). ( 88 )

The term 'kapok' here means the fluffy material coming from trees, creepers and even from potakī-grass. Even cotton is included here. The bed or stool upholstered with kapok is an example of a cushioned chair.

**7. The seventh sikkhāpada states :**

When a sitting-cloth is being made by a bhikkhu it must be made according to the (prescribed) measurements. Here are the measurements: two spans in length of the sugata-span, one and a half across, and the border a span. For one who exceeds that, there is (a case entailing) expiation with cutting down. ( 89 )

The sitting-cloth in Pāli is called *nisīdana* and has been allowed as a special requisite of which only one should be determined for use. In this training-rule there are the limits: first, two spans in length and one and a half across; but later it proved to be too small for a fat bhikkhu so the Exalted Buddha allowed that a border of one more span could be added to the edge. Because of the simple term 'a span' which does not refer directly to length or width it has lead the Vinaya-experts to understand it in different ways. I shall discuss it again in the section dealing with the use of the requisites in Book Two. If we think that the border is allowed as an addition to make up enough to sit on, then we should likely understand to which side the border should be added. But if the limit of the border does not exceed a square span, it seems a point to be investigated. All explanations should be understood as in the fifth training-rule.

**8. The eighth sikkhāpada states :**

When a (skin - ) eruption covering-cloth is being made by a bhikkhu it must be made according to the (prescribed) measurements. Here are the measurements: four



span in length of the sugata-span and two spans across. For one exceeding that there is (a case entailing) expiation with cutting down. (90)

This cloth is allowed as a special requisite which should be determined for use during the time of illness when a bhikkhu suffers from skin eruptions, such as smallpox, chickenpox, irritation, whitlow or sores from which pus and lymph ooze out and foul the body. The limit of the cloth is clearly laid down in this training-rule.

**9. The ninth sikkhāpada states:**

When a rains cloth is being made by a bhikkhu it must be made according to the (prescribed) measurements. Here are the measurements: six spans in length of the sugata-span and two and a half across. For one exceeding that there is (a case entailing) expiation with cutting down. (91)

This rains-cloth has been explained already in the fourth training-rule of *Pattavagga* (Nissaggiya-pācittiya) dealing with searching for and making it up for use.

**10. The tenth sikkhāpada states:**

Should any bhikkhu have a robe made to the measurements of a sugata-robe or bigger it entails expiation with cutting down. Here are the measurements of the Sugata's sugata-robe: nine spans in length of the sugata-span and six span across. These are the measurements of the Sugata's sugata-robe. (92)

Given this measurement it leads to the assumption that in those days a bhikkhu used a small robe as big as a large blanket for the winter. I shall discuss fully about this matter in the section dealing with use of the requisites in Book Two.

## SUMMARY

A bhikkhu who breaks any of the training-rules in this chapter is pācittiya in the same way, but the ill-repute is not equal, for example, compare the case of eating food without having it offered, with telling a lie. A careless bhikkhu will think that he can break all training-rules without incurring ill-repute and an over-strict bhikkhu will regard every training-rule as equally important giving rise to inconvenience. I desire to let the Vinaya-student realize the essential meaning clearly so that his practice will bring benefits to him so I have summarized the training-rules of this chapter classifying them into groups according to whether they give rise to greater or lesser ill-repute, giving examples for consideration, as follows:

**1) conduct leading to becoming an evil man :**

telling a lie,  
slandering,  
drinking intoxicants,  
accusing baselessly of saṅghādisesa.

**2) conduct showing cruelty :**

abusiveness,  
giving a blow,  
raising the hand in a threatening manner,  
killing an animal.

**3) conduct leading to ill-repute :**

telling about the evil of others,  
concealing the evil of others,  
sitting in a screened place with a woman,  
lying down in the same place as a woman,  
travelling with smugglers,  
travelling with a woman,  
eavesdropping upon others' business,  
seeing fallen things and picking them up thinking them  
to be lost.



**4) conduct showing naughtiness:**

playfully poking ( with the fingers ),  
playing in the water,  
making other bhikkhus afraid of ghosts,  
concealing as a joke the requisites of others,  
provoking worry in another bhikkhu.

**5) conduct showing ill manners:**

accepting first one invitation but eating at a later one,  
not sharing with other bhikkhus large amounts of sweet  
confections,  
sitting intrusively in a family when they are eating,  
accepting invitations (*pavāraṇā*) beyond the limit,  
using a robe in which another's share is not given up,  
giving someone an offering to be made to the Sangha,  
blaming the bhikkhu appointed to carry out  
Sangha-duties,  
being careless in Vinaya,  
giving a vote for proper acts and blaming later,  
agitating for a legal process already settled to be re-opened,  
getting up from the seat without giving a vote,  
decrying later when a robe has been properly given by  
the sangha in concord.

**6) conduct showing carelessness:**

laying down outside what is sangha property but not  
putting it away,  
laying down a bed-cloth in a sangha-vihāra to block the  
place,  
pouring water with creatures on grass or soil,  
drinking water with creatures in it.

**7) conduct destroying the good tradition of  
bhikkhus :**

lying-down with an *anupasampanna*,  
digging the soil,  
breaking plant-life,  
eating a group-meal,  
refusing food but later eating again,  
eating in the *vikāla*,  
eating food kept overnight,  
eating food which has not been offered,  
asking for the five fine foods,  
warming oneself by a fire without being ill,  
wearing cloth without making the bindu,  
entering the village in *vikāla* without taking leave,  
making ivory needle-cases,  
making beds and stools with legs exceeding the limit,  
making beds and stools upholstered with fluffy materials,  
making robes and some other cloths exceeding the limits.

The Master has laid down these training-rules in order to stop bhikkhus from falling into these offences and to bring the benefits of beautiful moral conduct to his disciples.



## CHAPTER VIII

### PĀṬIDESANĪYA

This term is the name of āpatti meaning "that which should be confessed" as well as the name of training-rules meaning "the pāṭidesanīya āpatti should be given to him." There are four training-rules.

#### 1. The first sikkhāpada states :

Should any bhikkhu accept with his own hand harder foods or softer foods from the hand of a bhikkhuni not related to him who has gone into an inhabited area and should he chew or consume them, that should be confessed by the bhikkhu thus: "Friend, I have done a censurable thing which is unbecoming and should be confessed. That I confess".

#### 2. The second sikkhāpada states:

(It may be that) bhikkhus have been invited and are eating in families (and that) if a bhikkhuni is standing there giving directions thus: "Give curry here, give rice there", then the bhikkhuni must be asked to desist thus: "Sister, leave us while the bhikkhus are eating". If not even one bhikkhu should speak asking her to desist thus: "Sister, leave us while the bhikkhus are eating", it should be confessed by the bhikkhus thus: "Friend, we have done a censurable thing which is unbecoming and should be confessed. That we confess".

### 3. The third sikkhāpada states:

There are kinds of families declared Initiate (*sekha*, in which both husband and wife are both at least Stream-enterers and are also poor). Should any bhikkhu who is not sick accept with his own hand without a previous invitation, harder foods or softer foods among such families and chew or consume them, it should be confessed by the bhikkhu thus: "Friend, I have done a censurable thing which is unbecoming and should be confessed. That I confess".

The term *sekha* is the name of persons who have attained the lower Paths and Fruits up to *Arahatta-magga*. It means, "one still training" (or Initiate), that is, one who is practising to attain the higher Dhamma. A family having strong confidence because they are *sekha* but poor, may be declared to be *sekha* by the sangha according to the Exalted Buddha's allowance concerning them, so that bhikkhus are prohibited from receiving almsfood from that family in order to save them from hardship, unless they invite bhikkhus, or unless a bhikkhu is sick. When there is no such reason, a bhikkhu who brazenly enters their house is *pāṭidesaniya* by this third rule.

### 4. The fourth sikkhāpada states:

There are the kinds of forest abodes reputed dangerous and risky (on account of robbers, etc). Should any bhikkhu living in such an abode proceed without first having announced this fact to accept with his own hand in his own Wat harder foods or softer foods and, not being sick, chew or consume them (thereby endangering supporters who may bring food to him), it should be confessed by the bhikkhu thus: "Friend, I have done a censurable thing which is unbecoming and should be confessed. That I confess."



## SEKHIYA

This term is the name of the dhamma called *vatta* (meaning 'duty' or 'tradition'), itself meaning, 'that which should be practised'. It is divided into four groups. The first is called *Sāruppa* dealing with traditions to be practised when entering towns and villages. The second group is called *Bhojanapaṭisaṃyutta* dealing with the tradition of accepting almsfood and eating meals. The third group is called *Dhammadesanāpaṭisaṃyutta* dealing with traditions of not teaching Dhamma to disrespectful people. The fourth group is called *Pakiṇṇaka* dealing with the manner of urinating and stooling. The Vibhaṅga classifies the training-rules into tens like the pācittiyas but this method is rather confused so I have arranged them in the way stated above.

### I. SĀRUPPA—On Proper Behaviour.

There are twenty-six training-rules here being arranged into thirteen pairs as follows :

#### 1-2. The first and second sikkhāpadas state :

I shall wear ( the under-robe ) correctly : this is a training to be done.

I shall put on (the upper-robe ) correctly : this is a training to be done.

'To wear correctly' means to wear the under-robe neatly, covering the navel at the upper edge but not reaching the chest ; while the lower edge covers the knees to halfway down the calves but not reaching the ankle. This is called wearing correctly. (The Vibhaṅga-compiler) has not explained clearly how to put the upper-robe on. He said only this much : "putting two corners together evenly without letting either corner drop down". According to the tradition practised in the present day, inside the wat it is worn with one shoulder open, that is, covering the left

shoulder and arm while the right is open, covering the knees equal to the length of the under-robe. When entering the village the upper-robe is drawn over both shoulders and arms, the hollow of the neck and both knees as stated above. This pair refers to the manner of wearing and putting on according to the bhikkhus' tradition but also instructs them how to wear them correctly, prohibiting untidy and hitched-up ways of wearing. Even though a bhikkhu does cover the three circles (of the neck, the waist, and below the knees), if he does so in an untidy and hitched-up manner, this contravenes bhikkhu tradition.

### **3-4. The third and fourth sikkhāpadas state :**

I shall go well covered in inhabited areas: this is a training to be done.

I shall sit well covered in inhabited areas: this is a training to be done.

Having worn the cīvaras correctly, a bhikkhu must be careful that they do not slip up or down when he enters a village ( etc.). If either of the cīvara slip, he must be mindful to cover his limbs. This is the instruction according to this pair of training-rules. Moreover, this pair of training-rules proves that bhikkhus should cover both shoulders when entering a village or town.

### **5-6. The fifth and sixth sikkhāpadas state:**

I shall go well restrained in inhabited areas: this is a training to be done.

I shall sit well restrained in inhabited areas: this is a training to be done.

The term 'well restrained' means keeping the limbs calm, not exuberant, not shaking or waving the hands or feet in play, such as shuffling the feet or wiggling the fingers, but it does not prohibit a bhikkhu from using his hands and feet when there is something to be done.



**7-8. The seventh and eighth sikkhāpadas state:**

I shall go with downcast eyes in inhabited areas: this is a training to be done.

I shall sit with downcast eyes in inhabited areas: this is a training to be done.

A bhikkhu is instructed to look only the length of one yoke ahead, that is, four sork (two metres) in length but his eyes can see further than this. If he casts his eyes down such a short distance, it seems pretentious and not natural in manner. This is not only going too far but becomes a mere blind following (of the sikkhāpada). The purpose of this pair is to instruct bhikkhus to maintain their natural manner and though they may look far ahead, it should be done with their eyes downcast and without opening them widely. There are words occurring in some suttas saying that a bhikkhu who is not blindly going along may see dangerous elephants and horses approaching him and so know how to avoid them as other people do. He should not be conceited (and risk his life).

**9-10. The ninth and tenth sikkhāpadas state:**

I shall not go (with civara) hitched up in inhabited areas: this is a training to be done.

I shall not sit (with civara) hitched up in inhabited areas: this is a training to be done.

'To hitch up' his civara means to raise it up so that people can see the side of a bhikkhu's body such as to raise his civara up onto his shoulder.

**11-12. The eleventh and twelfth sikkhāpadas state:**

I shall not go laughing loudly in inhabited areas: this is a training to be done.

I shall not sit laughing loudly in inhabited areas: this is a training to be done.

'To laugh loudly' means to guffaw while giggling is also included in this pair. These things lead to a decrease of restraint and when there is some amusing subject from which one cannot hold back mirth, then one should grin or smile.

**13-14. The thirteenth and fourteenth sikkhāpadas state:**

I shall go with little sound in inhabited areas: this is a training to be done.

I shall sit with little sound in inhabited areas: this is a training to be done.

The term 'little sound' is the opposite of a loud noise but it does not mean whispering. In short, it is the natural human voice. According to the opinion of the Atthakathā-teachers, the proper sound has been defined as follows: sitting separated at a distance of twelve sork (six metres) one speaks and another can hear but cannot clearly catch what he has said. One who sits at a distance of six sork can hear clearly, so this defines the proper sound. This sound is good when one is in conversation but it seems too weak at the time of giving sermons in a place where there is a gathering of many people. Though a bhikkhu speaks louder than the limit suggested by the Atthakathā-teachers, yet if he does not lessen his restraint—that is, he does not shout, it seems that it will be quite proper.

**15-16. The fifteenth and sixteenth sikkhāpadas state:**

I shall not go fidgetting (swaggering, staggering) the body in inhabited areas: this is a training to be done.

I shall not sit fidgetting (swaying) the body in inhabited areas: this is a training to be done.

The manner of fidgetting the body through pride or weakness is altogether prohibited. A bhikkhu should walk and sit down having the body straight.



**17-18. The seventeenth and eighteenth sikkhāpadas state:**

I shall not go fidgetting (swinging) the arms in inhabited areas: this is a training to be done.

I shall not sit fidgetting (gesticulating) the arms in inhabited areas: this is a training to be done.

The manners of fidgetting the arms because of pride or for showing graceful movement are all prohibited. A bhikkhu is taught not to swing the arms when walking. As a matter of fact, the arms help a person to balance himself such as when crossing a (plank-) bridge and with the arms extended a person can thus balance himself (so that on such an occasion) it is obviously better to stretch out the arms rather than keeping them close to the body. So when there is an occasion for using the arms, there will be no harm in it.

**19-20. The nineteenth and twentieth sikkhāpadas state:**

I shall not go fidgetting (shaking, drooping) the head in inhabited areas: this is a training to be done.

I shall not sit fidgetting (shaking, drooping) the head in inhabited areas: this is a training to be done.

A bhikkhu is taught to hold his head straight and not to let it droop like one who has no strength to hold it up. A bhikkhu should have a pleasing and dignified deportment.

**21-22. The twenty-first and twenty-second sikkhāpadas state:**

I shall not go with arms akimbo in inhabited areas: this is a training to be done.

I shall not sit with arms akimbo in inhabited areas: this is a training to be done.

The term 'with arms akimbo' means walking with the hands upon the hips, or when sitting, propping up the body with one arm or both.

**23-24. The twenty-third and twenty-fourth sikkhāpadas state:**

I shall not go with the head covered in inhabited areas: this is a training to be done.

I shall not sit with the head covered in inhabited areas: this is a training to be done.

The manner of covering one's body where it should be covered is a good tradition but to cover the limbs which should be open is censurable, so it is prohibited by this pair of training-rules.

**25-26. The twenty-fifth and twenty-sixth sikkhāpadas state:**

I shall not go walking on toes and heels in inhabited areas: this is a training to be done.

I shall not sit clasping the knees in inhabited areas: this is a training to be done.

The manner of walking on the toes means not touching the ground with all of the foot and is prohibited by the first sikkhāpada of this pair. A dhikkhu should walk using all the foot. The manner of sitting here is to clasp the knees with the arms or to bind up the body with a cloth and is prohibited by the latter training-rule. To sit clasping the knees with the hands and arms is much used in this country but to sit binding the body with a cloth is not practised. I have seen ancient pictures showing fat men who used this latter method because it helped them to balance their bodies.



In the Sekhiya training-rules, the āpatti is not given directly and there is only "this training should be done". The Vibhaṅga explains that if one becomes careless and departs from these traditions, one is dukkaṭa. One who has determined to behave properly according to this tradition but who breaks it without intention and out of absent-mindedness, or one who does not know about himself, or one who does not know how to behave properly, or who has some illness, is exempt and āpatti does not fall upon him. A bhikkhu who stays in a house in a village passing a day or night there can put aside without harm some of these matters which cannot be practised at all times, such as covering the body (the third and fourth sikkhāpadas above) having downcast eyes, and so on. Whatever he has practised in the wat can be done in the house where he stays but he should do this in the room arranged for his accommodation. When he goes out from his room, as when he goes out to the houses or rooms of others, he should practise according to the tradition of 'entering the house or village'.

## II. BHOJANA-PATISAMYUTTA—The Group on Food.

There are thirty training-rules here but they are not classified into pairs as are the *Sāruppa*.

### 1. The first sikkhāpada states :

I shall accept almsfood appreciatingly : this is a training to be done.

This rule teaches bhikkhus to show their appreciation of the donors, for they should not look down on them, while they should show their appreciation of the food given to them. They should not behave in such a way (as to suggest that) they are accepting it to play with it or to throw it away later.

### 2. The second sikkhāpada states :

I shall accept almsfood with attention on the bowl : this is a training to be done.

This rule teaches a bhikkhu not gaze at the donor's face, or to look carelessly in other directions.

### 3. The third sikkhāpada states :

I shall accept almsfood with other foods (*sūpa*) in proportion : this is a training to be done.

The term *sūpa* in other places may be rendered as 'curry' but the Vibhaṅga-compiling Teachers may have thought that it was a liquid which could not be brought back so they explained in the Vibhaṅga that it is made of green pulses or white pulses that can be grasped in the hand. It seems to be something eaten with rice, but in other places things eaten with rice are represented by the word *vyañjana*. Since the Vibhaṅga has explained in this way, the practice of bhikkhus has been concerned with the limited acceptance of curries made of pulses. Such understanding is rather narrow. The Vibhaṅga's explanation does perhaps relate to the foods in use at that time.

I understand that the tradition of *piṇḍapāta* then was not the same as it is now. Rather than the donors waiting to give to the bhikkhus (as is the practice now) the bhikkhus went to stand in front of the houses or shops so that the donors gave whatever they usually had, or whatever was placed there for sale. For this reason, a bhikkhu is prohibited from selecting (from among donors) too much *sūpa*. At present, the almsfood is prepared separately and bhikkhus cannot choose between accepting this or that but there is a good manner in which bhikkhus should behave respecting this rule, that is, a bhikkhu should accept from the donor whom he reaches first. He should not pass by donors who give only plain rice, hurrying to accept from those who give rice and other food to go with it.

### 4. The fourth sikkhāpada states :

I shall accept almsfood level with the edge (of the bowl) : this is a training to be done.



The edge here means the bottom edge (of the hoop of iron round the top of the bowl). A bhikkhu is prohibited from accepting almsfood above that edge (of his bowl) because to accept more would show his greed. But foods wrapped up in banana leaves and so on which project above the edge of the bowl are not counted as accepting above the bowl's edge. According to the tradition of the present day, to accept much on the basis of greediness is censurable, while to accept much on the basis of *mettā* is not censurable. For example, when a newly ordained bhikkhu is invited to accept food in the family, if he accepts only one bowlful then not everyone will have the chance to place food in his bowl. If someone takes his bowl to empty it and then he continues to accept till everyone has had the chance to put in food, this will not be bad conduct and nobody will blame him for greed.

**5. The fifth sikkhāpada states:**

I shall eat the almsfood appreciatingly: this is a training to be done.

Though that almsfood is coarse, a bhikkhu should not do anything unusual but should eat in the ordinary way. Once our Master accepted (and ate) griddled flat chapattis offered by the serving-maid *Puṇṇadāsī* who worked in some family, without showing any dislike, this being an example of eating almsfood appreciatingly. Moreover, when a bhikkhu is eating, he should eat with intention to do just that and not to do something else while eating. This is also regarded as eating almsfood appreciatingly.

**6. The sixth sikkhāpada states:**

I shall eat almsfood with attention on the bowl: this is a training to be done.

This rule prohibits a bhikkhu from looking at other things while eating; but looking only in relation to eating, such as to see whether the next bhikkhu has enough food to eat or not so as to give to him, is not prohibited.

**7. The seventh sikkhāpada states:**

I shall eat the almsfood evenly : this is a training to be done.

This rule prohibits bhikkhus from taking food from only one place (in their bowls) until a hole (in the food) is made, while it teaches bhikkhus to collect rice into lumps for the mouth.

**8. The eighth sikkhāpada states:**

I shall eat the almsfood with curries in proportion (*sama*): this is a training to be done.

The term *sama* has been explained by the Atthakathā-teachers as 'equal' which means one part of curries etc., to four parts of rice. This rule prohibits a bhikkhu from being gluttonous like a child. Though he eats curries in proportion more than one to four but not more in amount than the rice he may do this for he does not thereby depart from the Pāli and is not gluttonous. But the understanding that a bhikkhu eating curry made of pulses (in greater proportion to the rice), this (only) being prohibited, is certainly narrow. If an inviter serves something without rice, a bhikkhu can eat it.

**9. The ninth sikkhāpada states:**

I shall not eat the almsfood working down from the top: this is a training to be done.

It is a tradition for a bhikkhu that when he eats he should level off the rice in his bowl keeping it even. Things eaten with rice or with sweet which are brought to him piled up on a plate cannot be taken like this, levelling off the top. In this case he can take from the top.

**10. The tenth sikkhāpada states:**

I shall not hide curries and other foods with rice out of desire to get more: this is a training to be done.



This refers to eating in a place where bhikkhus are invited and where donors are waiting to serve whatever the bhikkhu likes to eat.

**11. The eleventh sikkhāpada states:**

I shall not, unless sick, ask for curry or rice for my own benefit and eat it: this is a training to be done.

The term 'to ask for' means to ask from householders who are not a bhikkhu's relatives and have not given him invitation to ask. If he is sick, being deprived of favourable food and is not happy, he is allowed to ask. And a bhikkhu who is not sick can ask on behalf of a sick bhikkhu.

**12. The twelfth sikkhāpada states:**

I shall not look finding fault with another's bowl: this is a training to be done.

To look with the thought of finding fault at another bhikkhu's uncouth way of eating is prohibited by this rule but to look with the thought of giving food to another bhikkhu who has not enough, is not prohibited.

**13. The thirteenth sikkhāpada states:**

I shall not make up an extra-large mouthful: this is a training to be done.

"An extra-large mouthful" of food which cannot all be put into a bhikkhu's mouth is regarded as the meaning here. A bhikkhu should make it the right size for putting easily into his mouth. Other sorts of food (apart from rice) are not prohibited but if it is a cause for bad manners, it should not be done.

**14. The fourteenth sikkhāpada states:**

I shall make up a round mouthful: this is training to be done.

The point to be considered here is what sort of rice was eaten at the time of compiling the *sekhiyavatta*. Phra Upāligunū-pamācariya (Pān) of Wat Phra Jetuphon used to speak about this subject to me. He was convinced that it was like the glutinous rice (of the present time) and I tend to agree with him. If it was not glutinous rice, then it may have been a certain kind of rice or grain resembling it, or else ordinary rice boiled wet, so that it could be made into round lumps. Moreover, the Vibhaṅga prohibits a bhikkhu from making up long-shaped lumps, so it is certain that it can be made round. The manner of eating which is regarded as polite here, is to make the food into round mouthfuls and this has been taught here. If we understand first the sort of grain eaten by the people (at that time) then we can understand the following rules.

**15. The fifteenth sikkhāpada states:**

I shall not open the mouth when the mouthful is not brought to it: this is a training to be done.

From this we know that the tradition of eating food was to close the mouth when chewing, opening it only when the mouthful was brought near to it.

**16. The sixteenth sikkhāpada states:**

I shall not put all the fingers into the mouth when eating: this is a training to be done.

The term "hand" here is explained in the *Tikā* as meaning 'fingers' and this must be correct. This rule prohibits a bhikkhu from dirtiness. If he puts his fingers in his mouth, even though not all, it is not good.

**17. The seventeenth sikkhāpada states:**

I shall not speak with the mouth full: this is a training to be done.



As long as a bhikkhu has food in his mouth he cannot speak in a normal voice, so he should not speak until he has swallowed that food or else spat it out, – then he can speak.

**18. The eighteenth sikkhāpada states:**

I shall not eat tossing up (into the air) a lump of food: this is a training to be done.

This rule prohibits tossing up rice lumps from the hand to catch them in the open mouth which is just one sort of naughtiness.

**19. The nineteenth sikkhāpada states:**

I shall not eat biting upon a lump of rice: this is a training to be done.

The biting into (lit, breaking up) of other things such as hard sweets or fruits is allowed but this rule prohibits a bhikkhu from eating sloppily. The biting of other foods (besides rice) is ugly and a bhikkhu should avoid doing so except in a country where biting is not considered ugly. Perhaps at the time of the Vibhaṅga's composition, the people of that time and place might not have considered it bad manners (to bite upon other foods) and therefore it was allowed to do so.

**20. The twentieth sikkhāpada states:**

I shall not eat stuffing out (the cheeks): this is a training to be done.

This rule prohibits a bhikkhu from putting too much into his mouth at one time until his cheeks are blown out like those of a flautist. Other foods (apart from rice) are allowed (by the Vibhaṅga) but a bhikkhu should know what is suitable and behave in a proper way.

**21. The twenty-first sikkhāpada states:**

I shall not eat shaking the hand about: this is a training to be done.

If boiled rice sticks to his hands then a bhikkhu should wash them with water.

**22. The twenty-second sikkhāpada states:**

I shall not eat scattering rice about: this is a training to be done.

This rule prohibits bhikkhus from letting rice-grains which could not be put into the mouth, fall back into the bowl or onto the floor.

**23. The twenty-third sikkhāpada states:**

I shall not eat putting the tongue out: this is a training to be done.

**24. The twenty-fourth sikkhāpada states:**

I shall not eat making a champing sound: this is a training to be done.

**25. The twenty-fifth sikkhāpada states:**

I shall not eat making a sucking sound: this is a training to be done.

The sound of champing occurs at the time of chewing upon hard food, while the sound of sucking is heard at the time of drinking liquids. A bhikkhu should be careful about this.

**26. The twenty-sixth sikkhāpada states:**

I shall not eat cleaning (or licking) the hand: this is a training to be done.



The term "licking the hand" here does not only mean to lick food sticking to the hand with the tongue but implies also picking at morsels of food sticking to the hand and then placing them in the mouth using the fingers ( of the other hand ).

**27. The twenty-seventh sikkhāpada states:**

I shall not eat cleaning ( or scraping ) the bowl ( with the fingers ) : this is a training to be done.

When the boiled rice in the bowl is so little that it cannot be made into a lump, a bhikkhu is prohibited from collecting it into a lump and eating it. To do so is called "eating scraping the bowl".

**28. The twenty-eighth sikkhāpada states:**

I shall not eat cleaning ( or licking ) the lips ( with the tongue ) : this is a training to be done.

**29. The twenty-ninth sikkhāpada states:**

I shall not accept a drinking-water pot with a hand soiled by food : this is a training to be done.

It was a tradition for bhikkhus in those days that when they had eaten and were satisfied, they accepted water. They were prohibited from accepting water with a hand soiled by food. But at present water is received at the same time as the food. It should be understood that a bhikkhu is prohibited from touching a water pot with soiled hands. If both hands of a bhikkhu are soiled by food, they should be washed before accepting.

**30. The thirtieth sikkhāpada states:**

I shall not, in an inhabited area, throw away bowl-washing water which has rice grains in it : this is a training to be done.

This rule means that a bhikkhu is eating in a house and washing his bowl there. At that time, it seems as though the water without rice-grains in it was not important and therefore it was forbidden to throw away the water with rice-grains. At present, even water without rice-grains should not be thrown away. A bhikkhu should empty it into the spittoon which is put there for that purpose when it can then be thrown away by someone else. If a bhikkhu throws the water away by himself in a place which is unsuitable, then this conduct is also not good.

### Summary

This tradition of eating food should be upheld according to its purpose, that is, the required neatness and propriety. Bhikkhus should not only take the literal meaning, that is, the manner of eating taught in this section, because it was set forth in the tradition of those days. In the course of time tradition has changed. If bhikkhus insist on behaving according to the ways set forth above, they could seem (to modern eyes) rather messy, perhaps even uncouth. For example, in the upper classes (of Thai society) people eat using a spoon and fork, or chopsticks with a spoon. If bhikkhus behave strictly according to the way taught in the *Sekhiya* using their hands, it may seem ugly and messy to those upper-class people who serve them. Bhikkhus should learn how to eat according with the times. \*

A bhikkhu who does not take care of the traditions of eating and who eats greedily and in a dirty way, is dukkaṭa. A bhikkhu who intends to behave according to tradition but who does wrongly without intention, without mindfulness and without knowledge (of these rules), or who is sick, is free from the usual āpatti.

---

\* These remarks in this Summary refer to the traditions practised in city wats. In the forest wats, the original practices as outlined by the Trainings in this section, are still followed strictly. (Translators).



### **III. DHAMMADESANĀPAṬISAMĪYUTTA**

#### **—The Group on Teaching Dhamma.**

There are sixteen training-rules here. The first eleven rules deal with the manner of persons, as follows:

**1. The first sikkhāpada states:**

I shall not teach Dhamma to one with an umbrella in his hand (and) who is not sick: this is a training to be done.

**2. The second sikkhāpada states:**

I shall not teach Dhamma to one with a staff in his hand (and) who is not sick: this is a training to be done.

**3. The third sikkhāpada states:**

I shall not teach Dhamma to one with a knife in his hand (and) who is not sick: this is a training to be done.

**4. The fourth sikkhāpada states:**

I shall not teach Dhamma to one with a weapon in his hand (and) who is not sick: this is a training to be done.

**5. The fifth sikkhāpada states:**

I shall not teach Dhamma to one wearing (wooden-soled) sandals (and) who is not sick: this is a training to be done.

**6. The sixth sikkhāpada states:**

I shall not teach Dhamma to one wearing footwear who is not sick: this is a training to be done.

**7. The seventh sikkhāpada states:**

I shall not teach Dhamma to one in a vehicle (and) who is not sick: this is a training to be done.

**8. The eighth sikkhāpada states:**

I shall not teach Dhamma to one on a couch (and) who is not sick: this is a training to be done.

**9. The ninth sikkhāpada states:**

I shall not teach Dhamma to one who sits grasping the knees (and) who is not sick: this is a training to be done.

**10. The tenth sikkhāpada states:**

I shall not teach Dhamma to one wearing a head-wrapping (and) who is not sick: this is a training to be done.

**11. The eleventh sikkhāpada states:**

I shall not teach Dhamma to one with his head covered (and) who is not sick: this is a training to be done.

The 'staff' is four sork (two metres) in length and used for striking. It is paired with the truncheon of only one sork in length, also used for striking but this is not mentioned here. 'Knife' and 'weapon' are a pair which differ, as follows: the 'knife' is a sharpened instrument and would include swords and halberds; while the 'weapon' is some missile projected, such as arrows or bullets. The statement 'to one with a knife/weapon in his hand' covers the meaning of having these instruments attached to his body, but the Atthakathā allows knives and weapons to be attached to the body so long as they are not held in the hands. This statement may mean that soldiers who have knives and weapons attached to their bodies and citizens with knives attached in the same way, as Malaysians and Javanese who wear the kris (a wavy-bladed dagger), are conforming to a tradition of those who like to fight, having weapons about them in this way. As it does not show their anger, the leniency of the Atthakathā is correct here.



'Sandals' and 'footwear' differ in this way: A 'wooden-soled sandal' has a sole while 'footwear' has no sole but some kinds of footwear which a bhikkhu is prohibited from using are sometimes also called 'wooden-soled sandals'. In ancient times, umbrellas, wooden-soled sandals and footwear were regarded as things showing disrespect, so it is prohibited to pass by the cetiya compound having an open umbrella and with footwear on. But this tradition has been changed (in lay society) and polite people now put on footwear when entering an assembly, including the royal court. Men who do not put on footwear are despised by other people who regard them as low. Considering this fact, those who put on footwear showing their politeness or respect should be allowed (to hear Dhamma), except in the case of footwear used in the house (such as slippers) which if used in society will cause the wearer to be looked down upon.

'Vehicles' may mean palanquins which are carried, or drawn vehicles upon which only one man can sit. If a vehicle is large enough so that they may sit together, then a bhikkhu can teach Dhamma.

The '*head-wrapping cloth*' is popularly used in some countries and among some communities such as some groups of Indians and Burmese. Perhaps keeping this tradition in mind, the Atthakathā Teacher specifically prohibited (from being taught Dhamma) those people whose heads were wrapped completely and whose topknot of hair could not be seen. This may be taken to mean that if a person does not wrap his head completely, a bhikkhu is allowed to teach (Dhamma). In the present time, many people use headgear (such as caps and hats) which is comparable with the head-wrapping cloths. If a hat is worn in a disrespectful way, then it cannot be done (to teach Dhamma) but if a person wears it according to his tradition or custom, as soldiers in the field, then it seems that Dhamma can be taught.

**12. The twelfth sikkhāpada states:**

I shall not while sitting on the ground teach Dhamma to one sitting on a seat who is not sick: this is a training to be done.

**13. The thirteenth sikkhāpada states:**

I shall not while sitting on a low seat teach Dhamma to one sitting on a high seat who is not sick: this is a training to be done.

**14. The fourteenth sikkhāpada states:**

I shall not while standing teach Dhamma to one sitting (and) who is not sick: this is a training to be done.

**15. The fifteenth sikkhāpada states:**

I shall not while walking behind teach Dhamma to one walking in front who is not sick: this is a training to be done.

**16. The sixteenth sikkhāpada states:**

I shall not while walking beside a path teach Dhamma to one walking on a path who is not sick: this is a training to be done.

It is a tradition for bhikkhus to show their respect by the posture of standing and therefore it is prohibited for bhikkhus to teach Dhamma to those sitting down. If both Teacher and listeners are standing, it can be done. In the same postures, high and low, front and behind are also to be upheld. A bhikkhu sitting on a low seat while teaching Dhamma to one sitting on a high seat is prohibited from doing so but when both parties sit on the same level, it is allowed. In the cases of walking in front /behind, on a path and beside it, it is the same.



In the Pāli, the phrase 'one who is not sick' is mentioned in every rule (of this section). This suggests that there is an exception made when the listener is sick, as in the case when a seated bhikkhu teaches Dhamma to a sick man lying on a bed, which is permitted. But some, or most, of these rules do not concern a sick man such as those concerning people with quarterstaves, knives or weapons in their hands. It seems that the phrase 'one who is not sick' has been inserted later when there was concern with special privileges to be given to a sick man. If at the time of insertion this phrase had not been added to all the rules then they would have been dissimilar but it was added to all alike so that the rules are as we have them now. According to my preference, it would have been better if this phrase had not been inserted. The sick man should be given special privileges in only some rules and these exceptions should have been mentioned in the *anāpattivāra* (exceptions for which one is not āpatti). When (the Teachers of old) did not explain according to (my preference), nothing can be explained since they mentioned the special exception for every rule. This seems to be awry. Moreover, to prohibit bhikkhus from teaching Dhamma to those who show disrespect is done from reverence for Dhamma and esteeming it above all other things. It is probable that this matter has been rather established by the disciples of the Buddha, than by the Master himself. This is one of the points which should be further investigated by Vinaya experts. In this group, the āpatti of dukkaṭa is given as usual to the bhikkhu who ignores these rules and persists in breaking them.

#### IV. PAKINNAKA — Miscellaneous.

There are three training-rules here. I shall explain about them briefly.

##### 1. The first sikkhāpada states :

I shall not, when not sick, stool or urinate while standing up: this is a training to be done.

**2. The second sikkhāpada states:**

I shall not, when not sick, stool, urinate or spit on green plants: this is a training to be done.

**3. The third sikkhāpada states:**

I shall not, when not sick, stool, urinate or spit into water: this is a training to be done.

It is a tradition of bhikkhus to squat down while urinating so as not to foul fields or farms where people are raising seedlings, or the drinking and washing water. Pasture which is well looked after now, is included under 'green plants'. *Bhūtagāma* (plants, see *Pācittiya* 11) which are not well looked after and are just growing by themselves are not included in this case. 'Water' means that water in wells and ponds which people have excavated, or natural reservoirs such as pools or lakes, or flowing waters such as canals or rivers. In all these cases it is prohibited to relieve oneself in such waters. An exception is in water not fit for use, such as polluted water, or sea water. In times of flood when there is no dry land upon which to relieve oneself, it is allowed to do so in water. Most of the ordinary people think that to release foul things into flowing water does not cause harm but bhikkhus have been convinced from the very beginning that this makes for polluted water, for there is this rule preventing bhikkhus from relieving themselves in flowing water. This tradition is finer than the understanding of ordinary people but few of them know about it. In this group too, the *āpatti* of *dukkata* is given to a bhikkhu who ignores and purposely breaks these rules but as usual there are exceptions (for a sick bhikkhu).



## CHAPTER IX

### ADHIKARAṆA-SAMATHA

This term is the name of either training-rules or dhammas meaning 'subduing the adhikaraṇa' comprising seven articles. We should know about the kinds of adhikaraṇa first.

Things which occur and should be dealt with are called '*adhikaraṇa*' (or legal processes). They are classified into four categories: *vivāda* or contention concerning Dhamma and Vinaya is called *vivādādhikaraṇa* and a judgement should be given whether right or wrong. The accusation of *āpatti* is called *anuvādādhikaraṇa* and judgement should be given as to whether it is true or false. The manner of falling into *āpatti* or the *āpatti* awarded is called *āpattādhikaraṇa* and this should be cleared up, that is, for release from the penalty. The duty which should be undertaken by the sangha, such as giving *upasampadā*, is called *kiccādhikaraṇa* and this should be completely carried out.

At the beginning, Dhamma and Vinaya was handed down by memory and explanation was needed of the *mātikā* (matrices) which were just quoted as the headings. Thus it was possible that bhikkhus had different understandings and began disputes when they spoke about Dhamma-Vinaya. It is not necessary to speak of those days, for even in the present lawyers have different understandings regarding national law. This is the way in which *vivādādhikaraṇa* is born. When it has occurred already, the judgement should be given by expert bhikkhus as to whether it is right or wrong so that it could be established as a pattern (for future cases). If this is not done, then the differences in understanding will become wider and wider so that there would be no

basic principles. There was an example in the time of King Asoka the Great. The Dhamma and Vinaya have flourished so long because there is rule and order for controlling (the Sangha). It can be compared with a thread linking flowers together and preventing the scattering of those flowers. Therefore the bhikkhu-community must abide by the same pattern.

Moreover, the Dhamma and Vinaya will flourish long because bhikkhus practise respectfully and according to them. If there are (bhikkhus) wicked, vulgar and shameless mixed in the community they will cause defilement there and it is the duty of a well-behaved bhikkhu when knowing and seeing this, to warn them personally, or to accuse them in the presence of the sangha in order to remedy their bad behaviour or to rid the sangha of shameless people. It is possible that shameless bhikkhus may also find fault with other bhikkhus, for example, Mettiya Bhikkhu and Bhummajaka Bhikkhu instructed Mettiyā Bhikkhunī to accuse Phra Dabbamallaputta Thera in the presence of the Master. In this way *anuvādādhikaraṇa* is born. When it has arisen, investigation should be made by expert bhikkhus as to whether it is true or not, and this should be undertaken according to what is righteous. If not according to righteousness then distrust will spread among the sangha leading to schism and lack of uniformity. When the dispute has been settled by Vinaya-experts, all bhikkhus must take heed of their decision and should not behave according to their own opinions because each one of them is a unit in the concord (of the whole). Otherwise, there is no power to settle disputes.

Again, the Dhamma-Vinaya is able to flourish long because there are well-behaved bhikkhus as stated above, therefore the Master laid down the training-rules as the principles guiding their behaviour and āpatti is awarded a bhikkhu who breaks the rules. This is the way that *Āpattādhikaraṇa* is born and when it has occurred it must be resolved by a procedure through a sangha or by an individual. Otherwise the training-rules will not yield any result and though they exist, yet it will be as though they did



not exist. Therefore, each bhikkhu should agree to make amends when he has āpatti. Again, our Master decided to hand over the government of the community to the Sangha, not permitting individuals to be independent, so He allowed the Sangha to carry out the duties of community government, such as receiving men for upasampadā as stated in the first chapter. In this way *Kiccādhikaraṇa* occurs. When it has occurred, it must be completed for if otherwise, that work will not go properly. Bhikkhus cannot stay idle doing nothing, or even doing something but not in time, for this also causes the sangha to deteriorate, so every bhikkhu should have a sense of responsibility and should accomplish the duty of the sangha in concord.

Due to these facts, the Master set forth the rules for settling the four *adhikaraṇa* called *adhikaraṇa-samatha* comprising seven articles, as follows:

1. *Sammukhāvinaya*—the procedure to be done in the presence of, that is, the manner of settling the legal process in the presence of the sangha, and in the presence of an individual, and in the presence of vatthu, and in the presence of Dhamma-Vinaya.

‘In the presence of the sangha’ means that the bhikkhus assembled there are complete as a sangha. ‘In the presence of an individual’ means the persons concerned in that matter are present there. ‘In the presence of vatthu’ means that the subject-matter is raised for judgement. ‘In the presence of Dhamma-Vinaya’ means that the judgement is correct according to Dhamma and Vinaya.

2. *Sativinaya*—the procedure setting up mindfulness as the main point, that is, the manner in which the sangha sets forth a motion announcing that an Arahant is a fully mindful person for the settlement of *anuvāḍādhikaraṇa*, there being an accusation against him regarding breaking of sīla.

3. *Amūḷhavinaya*—the procedure dealing with a bhikkhu who has recovered from insanity, that is, the manner in which the sangha set forth a motion announcing a person who is no longer

insane for the settlement of *anuvāḍādhikaraṇa*, there having been accusation about training-rules broken by him while he was insane.

If the term (*amūḷha*) is not preceded by the negative 'a-' then it would be only *mūḷhavinaya* meaning, procedure given to one who is insane, which has a better meaning.

4. *Paṭiññātakaraṇa*—doing according to what is admitted, that is, the āpatti is given according to the admission of the accused who admits truthfully what he has done. To confess āpatti to others is held to be 'doing *paṭiññā*' (admission) and is included in this article.

5. *Yebhuyyasikā*—the judgement made according to the words of the majority. This procedure is used when the opinions of many people differ and the majority's opinion should be taken.

6. *Tassa-pāpiyasikā*—the act of giving a penalty to one who has committed a fault. In the Samathakkhandhaka of the Cūlavagga it is explained that this is the procedure for adding a further penalty on top of the first fault. This is the same for people who have broken the law many times then being sentenced to increased punishment according to the state law. But this procedure should be grouped in the Kammakkhandhaka. I understand that this is the manner of giving a penalty to one who has done wrong even though he does not accept (his own guilt) truthfully, but testimony proves that he is guilty as stated in the Aniyata training-rules.

7. *Tiṇa-vatthāraka*—the covering over with grass, that is, the manner of reconciling both parties without proceeding to investigate the dispute. This procedure should be used in difficult and important cases which affect all the people concerned, such as the case of schism by the bhikkhus of Kosambi, and so forth.

*Sammukhāvinaya* can settle every kind of *adhikaraṇa*. *Sativinaya*, *Amūḷhavinaya* and *Tassa-pāpiyasikā* can settle only



*anuvādādhikaraṇa*. It is said that *Paṭiññātakaraṇa* and *Tiṇa-vatthāraka* can settle only *āpattādhikaraṇa* but I think that they can also settle *anuvādādhikaraṇa*. *Yebhuyyasikā* is used to settle only *vivādādhikaraṇa*.

The training-rules which have been explained so far are 227 in number and there is the Exalted Buddha's allowance to recite them in the Sangha-assembly upon the Uposatha-day of every (lunar) fortnight. Collectively, they are called *Pāṭimokkha*. If reference is made to some of these training-rules, then they are called 'training-rules coming in the *Pāṭimokkha*'. They should be upheld as the principles of Vinaya. If there is some obstacle to their practice, due to time and place, they should be upheld indirectly and not given up entirely, for otherwise there will be no principles (for discipline). A community without principles for discipline cannot last long and therefore I should like to give advice in this way.

**(Summary of Relations between the Seven rules and the Four types of Legal Processes)**

Sammukhāvinaya (1-4)	1. Vivādādhikaraṇa (contentions)
Sativinaya (2)	2. Anuvādādhikaraṇa (accusations)
Amūlḥavinaya (2)	3. Āpattādhikaraṇa (faults)
Paṭiññātakaraṇa (2, 3)	4. Kiccādhikaraṇa (duties)
Yebhuyyasikā (1)	
Tassa-pāpiyasikā (2)	
Tiṇa-vatthāraka (2, 3)	

## CHAPTER X

### MEASUREMENTS

There are some training-rules which contain references to standards of some measurements. Considering them all together they relate to nearly all kinds of measures and so it is proper to explain measurements here. Standards of measurement are called *mātrā*. They can be classified for our purposes into five kinds, namely.

- i ) time-measurement
- ii ) linear-measurement
- iii ) capacity-measurement
- iv ) weight-measurement
- v ) money-measurement

The standards of some of these measurements are differently described in the scriptures and the more carefully they are explained, the more obvious are the discrepancies. I shall explain them to the extent necessary here.

#### 1. Time-measurement.

The standard of measurement is determined by one rotation of the earth around the sun which is one day. It is counted from the time of the seeing the faint reddening of the sky which is called dawn. It has the method of analysis and the method of synthesis. I shall explain the latter which is determined by the path of the moon :

15 or sometimes 14 days	= 1 pakkha (pakṣa) fortnight
2 fortnights	= 1 māsa month
4 months	= 1 utu (rtu) season
3 seasons	= 1 year

The explanation should be understood thus: The moon rotates about the earth once in 29½ days. If we count 29 days as



a month it is too little while 30 days as a month is too much. So we have to count 59 days as two months by having one month of thirty days and another of twenty-nine. Therefore a fortnight has sometimes fifteen and sometimes fourteen days. During one orbit of the moon, as it gets farther away, it becomes brighter until we see the whole of the moon lighted up which is called the Full Moon. The day on which the moon is full is called *Puṇṇamī*. The fortnight in which the moon reaches this point far from the sun is called *sukkapakkha*, the waxing moon. After the Full Moon, the moon gradually moves closer to the sun and the moonlight becomes dimmer until it cannot be seen. This is called the new moon. The day on which the moon is new is called *Amāvasī* meaning the lunar day during which the sun and moon live together, or is called new-moon day. As the moon moves closer to the sun that fortnight is called *kālapakkha*, the waning moon. These two fortnights make up one month.

The months are named after fixed stars being determined by the moon reaching those stars on the Full Moon day at midnight, as follows:

Māgasiramāsa	-	the first month (approximating to November-December)
Puṣṣamāsa*	-	second (December-January)
Māghamāsa	-	third (January-February)
Phaggunamāsa	-	fourth (February-March)
Cittamāsa	-	fifth (March-April)
Vesākhamāsa	-	sixth (April-May)
Jetthamāsa	-	seventh (May-June)
Āsāḷhamāsa	-	eighth (June-July)
Sāvanamāsa	-	ninth (July-August)
Bhaddapadamāsa	-	tenth (August-September)
Assayujamāsa or		
Paṭhamakattikamāsa	-	eleventh (September-October)
Kattikamāsa	-	twelfth (October-November)

\* (*Puṣṣamāsa* is used as the equivalent of *January* (and so on) when these names of lunar months are used for 'telling the era' before giving a sermon).  
Translators.

It is not stated in the Pāli which month has thirty days and which month has twenty-nine, and which fortnight has the dropped day (to become only fourteen). In the time of the Atthakathā the year was divided into two periods of six months in one of which, the months have thirty days and in the other, only twenty-nine but it is not clear that it fixes the alternate months (of thirty and twenty-nine days) as used in Siam. In the Chinese calculation there are dropped-day months and full months as well but they are not fixed as alternating. However (it is arranged), in a year there are only six months with dropped days.

In the Buddha-time, or when Pāli was written down, the fortnight of the waning moon came at the beginning of the month and that of the waxing moon at the end, and this (calculation) was practised until after 1200 B.E. as recorded in the books of Hsuan Chwang on pilgrimage in India. It seem to have been changed to count the waxing moon at the beginning of the month when astrology developed. In Siam, the fortnight of the waxing moon is counted at the beginning of the month, so time is counted one fortnight later than the Pāli reckoning. For example, the waxing fortnight of the first lunar month in Siam, becomes the second half of Māgasira month. One will see that a 'dropped day' should fall in the second part of a month but it is explained in Pāli that the Pavāraṇā Day falls on either the fourteenth or the fifteenth of a fortnight. If a month with a dropped day, and a full month, are arranged alternately as in Siam, in the former (or original) calculation it must fall on the fourteenth and in the latter calculation it will fall only on the fifteenth. There are perhaps, other methods of fortnightly calculation such as when months with dropped days and full days are not arranged alternately, or when one thinks of Pavāraṇā Day which is also put forward one fortnight, that is to the waning moon of the eleventh lunar month as practised in Siam. That Pavāraṇā Day then falls on the fourteenth.

#### *The Naming of the Three Seasons.*

1. Hemanta-ṛtu – the Winter Season. Beginning from the Māgasira month, [from the first day of the waning moon of twelfth lunar month]



2. *Gimha-ṛtu* – the Summer Season. Beginning from the Citta month, [from the first day of the waning moon of the fourth lunar month].

3. *Vassāna-ṛtu* – the Rainy Season. Beginning from the Sāvana month [from the first day of the waning moon of the eighth lunar month].

The new year begins with the *Māgasira* month, the beginning of the winter season. The years are not counted according to an era but only by observation of the Rains, for example, each individual *bhikkhu* reckons the number of his 'Phansā' (= *varṣa*, *vassa* or rains) which have passed since his *upasampadā*.

It is impossible to count time according to the Moon's motion only, because natural phenomena such as a lot of rain, drought, the fruiting of fruit(-trees) depend upon the sun's (apparent) motion. If one always relied upon the moon's motion, then these events will not fall in the right season. For this reason the calculation of the moon's motion must rely upon the solar motion. Twelve orbits of the moon are counted as one year, that is, twelve months, or 354 days. One orbit of the earth about the sun is however, also counted as one year of 365 days and more than six hours. There is a difference of more than eleven days so that every three years this adds up to more than one month. In order to prevent a wide divergence of the two calendars it is necessary to add one lunar month either in the third or in the second year so that (the lunar leap year) has thirteen months. This added month is called *adhikamāsa*. In one cycle of 19 years, the addition of *adhikamāsa* is made seven times. This system was also found in the Exalted Buddha's time which indicates that He allowed the day of entering the Rains-residence to be put forward by one month in accordance with the tradition used in *Rājagṛha* (*Rājagaha*, the capital of *Magadha*). (At that time), the traditions of adding the *adhikamāsa* in the month when the remaining lunar days complete one month—as in Chinese

tradition, or of adding it at the end of the Summer Season—as in Thai tradition,—were not known. There is only this relating to measurement of time connected with the sikkhāpada.

## 2. Linear Measurement.

This linear measurement helps us to understand distance: far and near, high and low, long and short, wide and narrow. It is thought that formerly fingers were used as a standard but for fractions the various limbs cannot be used and so rice-grains were used instead. But for whole units the limbs were used in this way:

7 rice-grains	=	1 fingersbreadth ('carpenter's fingers')
12 fingersbreadths	=	1 handspan (10", 25 cms).
2 handspans (kheup)	=	1 forearm (1'8", 50 cms).
4 forearms (sork)	=	1 wāh (2.188 yds, 2 m).
25 wāhs	=	1 usabha (54.7 yds, 50 m).
80 usabhas	=	1 gāvuta (2.48 miles, 4 km).
4 gāvutas	=	1 yojana (9.92 miles, 16 km).

This measurement is consistent with the one used in this country and agrees with that used in Jambudvīpa after B.E. 1200 when the Chinese bhikkhu named Hsuan Chwang went to India. In the *Abhidhānapadipikā*, rice-grains are called *dhaññamāsa*, while in Hsuan Chwang's records they are called *yava*. Thai people used to translate *yava* as 'glutinous rice' so I have laid out unhusked grains of glutinous rice comparing them with the (measurement of) carpenter's fingers. The unhusked grains of black glutinous rice are long and only six of them equal one carpenter's fingersbreadth. Seven unhusked grains of white glutinous rice are exactly equal to one carpenter's finger. But with fractions of the fingerbreadth it is more convenient to divide into eight parts.

Thus one fingerbreadth is divided into four parts and will be called (in Thai) 'kabiet'. One 'kabiet' is divided into two parts and will be called 'apukabiet'. For this reason, it is better



to use eight rice-grains as one fingerbreadth as practised by us in Siam. The linear measure from the rice-grain up to the forearm is found in the *Abhidhānapadīpikā*, while that from the forearm up to the *yojana* is found in the *Sankhyāpakāsaka*, and both of these scales have been explained in the *Pubbasikkhāvannanā*.

In the *sikkhāpada* relating to linear measures, short distances are measured handspan by handspan, just as (at present) they are measured by feet and inches, and this method is known as the *sugatapamāna*. Long distances up to the *yojana* are not said to be measured according to *sugatapamāna*. This point will be discussed further below.

#### *Another Method.*

4 forearms	=	1 bow (dhanu) (6'8")
500 bows	=	1 kosa (over $\frac{1}{2}$ mile).
4 kosas	=	1 gāvuta
4 gāvutas	=	1 yojana (10.1 miles).

This method is found in the book *Sankhyāpakāsaka* being used to measure the distance of a forest residence as mentioned in some training-rules.

### 3. Capacity Measurement.

The system here is derived from the linear measure. Linear measure is used for length and breadth while in a capacity measure, height is also used. This measure is used for amounts of such things as liquids or grains. It must be presumed that formerly coconut shells were used. For fractions however, the fistful or the handful was the standard, as we see below:

4 fistfuls (mutthi)	=	1 handful (kudhava)
2 kudhavas	=	1 pattha (of hands placed together)
2 patthas	=	1 nāli
4 nālis	=	1 ālahaka.

This measurement is rather uncertain, the terms *pattha* and *nālī* being specially difficult to understand. In all scriptures they are taken to be equal, but in the Vibhaṅga it is said of the capacity of a bowl (*pattha*): a small bowl can contain the boiled rice from one *pattha* of raw grain; a middle-sized bowl can contain boiled rice from one *nālī* of raw grain; while a large-sized bowl can contain the boiled rice from half an *ālahaka* of raw grain. This means the amount is doubled for each of these bowls. According to this statement, the *pattha* and the *nālī* must be different. Therefore, in the Abhidhānapadīpikā it said that four kudhavas are equal to one *pattha* but I regard 4 kudhavas = 1 *nālī*. Half of a *nālī* or two *kudhavas* is then one *pattha*. In this way, these measures can be put together properly.

Capacity measurements exceeding one *ālahaka* are found in Pāli but only the above terms are used in the Vinaya.

#### 4. Weight Measurement.

Capacity measurement is known by volume only, for example, rice-grains or sand measured by the *tanān* (approx. 1 quart) have the same volume but their measurement by weight must be found through scales. This kind of measure is for knowing the weight of things having *different* volume, such as various metals. At present, other goods are also weighed. It is understood that (the standard of) weight is based upon the *māsaka*, namely beans or big 'elephant-eyed' Indian liquorice seeds (*Abrus precatorius*). For fractions, the *kuñjā* of small 'mouse-eyed' liquorice seeds and unhusked grains may have been used.

Weight-measurements for things other than gold and silver, are as follows:

4	rice-grains	=	1	kuñjā
2	kuñjā	=	1	māsaka
5	māsaka	=	2	akkha
8	akkha	=	1	dharana
10	dharana	=	1	pala
100	pala	=	1	tulā
20	tulā	=	1	bhāra



Measures for gold and silver (other than money), that is, troy weight, are as follows:

4 rice-grains	=	1 kuñjā
2 kuñjā	=	1 māśaka
5 māśaka	=	2 akkha
8 akkha	=	1 dharāṇa
5 dharāṇa	=	1 suvaṇṇa
5 suvaṇṇa	=	1 nikkha

It is understood that gold and silver which is made into a lump is determined in weight by one *nikkha*, and this causes confusion since sometimes '*nikkha*' means a weight-measure but sometimes a lump.

This measurement is not complicated like the others but one must know how to distinguish the weight-measures for things in general, from the troy-weight. But why is it that Ācariyas understand differently in the equation, "5 māśaka = 2 akkha"? One cannot blame the Pāli explanatory verses as obscure but they understand differently by themselves. My understanding agrees with those Ācariyas who composed the *Sankhyāpakāśaka*.

### 5. Standards of Money

This mode is for measuring the value of goods using *kaḥāpana* as the standard unit of measurement. There are only units smaller than this but no larger ones. These are as follows:

5 māśaka	=	1 pāda
4 pāda	=	1 kaḥāpana

The explanation of them should be understood thus: There are many kinds of *kaḥāpana* but the *kaḥāpana* used in Rājagaha when the *adinnādāna sikkhāpada* was laid down, was called *nila-kaḥāpana*. It was said in many books that it was compounded of 5 māśaka of gold, 5 māśaka of silver, and 10 māśaka of copper. Some said that one rice-grain of iron was added but others have not written anything about this. These metals were alloyed, shaped and stamped with a seal. When we consider according to this, the substance of that *nila-kaḥāpana* is 'nāk' (an alloy of gold and copper) and the weight (of one *kaḥāpana*)

is one dharāṇa (see, weight). Māsaka in this measurement is not the same as the māsaka of the weight-measures, the name only being taken from the latter. In the Vibhaṅga it is said that the māsaka may be made of iron, wood, or lac but it was not clearly said of what the pāda was made,—whether it was made of nâk (the gold-copper alloy) like the kahāpana, or of other materials, or perhaps only the materials of the kahāpana and māsaka are (given), but not of the pāda which is not yet known. If the kahāpana was made of pure gold, its value can probably be compared with its weight but the kahāpana here is 'nâk', so when the Ācariyas compared it to gold-measurement, they have reduced its value by half, saying —

$$1 \text{ pāda} = \text{gold to the weight of 20 unhusked rice-grains}$$

According to this, 4 of these unhusked rice-grains will be equal to one māsaka. This leads us to assume that when those scriptures were written, the value of gold was double that of 'nâk'.

But I am not certain that the nīla-kahāpana was made of 'nâk' as I have not yet come to know in which ancient or modern country 'nâk' has been used for money. Only pure gold and silver have been used for this purpose\*. So when the Ācariyas suggested that we should compare the kahāpana with the value of gold, it is a clever method. If we understand that the nīla-kahāpana is pure gold weighing ten māsakas, which may be divided into 80 grains of unhusked rice, while its total weight will be equal to half a dharāṇa, then this statement is consistent. But one will compound with silver and copper, when the weight will be doubled and the value less, for what purpose?

These measurements though being determined as standards by natural things, such as limbs and seeds, vary considerably. For example, people in one country differ from those in other lands by their physical measurements, and what need is there to

\* The gold-standard was still commonly in use at the date of writing. (Translators).



speak of seeds! Therefore, the rulers of various countries have had to issue the standard for measurements in order that people will abide by them in case of disputes. This kind of standard is called 'Royal measurement'—such as the commonly named 'royal wāh' (approx 2 yards), 'royal tanān' (approx. 1 quart) or the 'sealed tanān'. If a person lives in a particular country, he should abide by the royal standards instituted in that country.

### Special Measurements.

In the training-rules, when they are referring to linear measurements, if to short linear measures they are measured by the sugatapamāṇa, such as the sugata-handspan or the sugata-finger. I have tried my best to find the way for understanding the sugatapamāṇa. Was it a special measure such as the inches of a foot, or the 'carpenters inches'? Though the term 'sugata' was an epithet of the Master, yet it was not a word alleged to be uttered by the Master referring to himself; nor was it a word used by His disciples in referring to the Master. However, my effort has been in vain because in the Pāṭimokkha one finds the phrase "*idaṃ sugatassa sugatacīvarappamāṇaṃ*" meaning "This is the measure of the Sugata's sugata-robe". One cannot understand this to mean other than the Master himself. When it is put like this, presumably the Master was using his own fingers as the standard for a short measurement because when a yojana is mentioned the term sugata-yojana is never used. This seems to be rather a measurement which was determined loosely for using temporarily but when the sikkhāpadas had been transmitted for a long time, that measurement became difficult to understand.

The Atthakathā-ācariya commented upon the word 'sugata-pamāṇa' in the Commentary on the *Saṅghādisesa* 5) saying that the sugata—handspan means three handspans of middle-sized people of that time, consequently being equal to one carpenters' forearms-length plus one handspan. Bearing this statement in mind, and according to the *Mahāpurisalakkhaṇa* (the Marks of a Great Man), the Master's height was equal to his own wāh (the distance between the fingertips with

the arms stretched out), that is, to 12 carpenters' forearms-length. So the Master was three times as high as ordinary men! The sugatapamāna in the training-rules must therefore be the carpenters' pamāna (measurement) of handspan and fingers multiplied by three. By doing so, everything measured in this way will become very large. I have never heard that anyone has considered this before except (the late Saṅgharāja) Somdetch Phra Mahā Samana Chao Krom Phrayā Pavaresvariyaṇkarana who was my upajjhāya. He concluded that the Master was not much larger than the other people of that time. He referred to some stories in support of his conclusion. I shall also bring forward some stories as illustration.

1. The Masters' half-brother, Phra Nanda, was handsome like the Master but he was four inches shorter. Nevertheless, he wore the same size of sugatacivara robe.

2. The Master exchanged his saṅghāti with Phra Mahā Kassapa.

3. King Ajātasattu went to see the Master one night. The Master sat surrounded by the groups of the bhikkhusaṅgha and the King could not recognize Him so he had to ask the doctor Jivaka Komārabhacca.

4. The youth Pukkusaṭi who went forth from his house out of devotion to the Master, met Him in the potter's workshop and did not know Him,—thinking that He was an ordinary monk.

The late Somdetch Phra Mahā Samana Chao's conclusion upon this matter could not be opposed by any scholar. When we come to agree that the Master was not so large as this, the sugatapamāna must also be shorter. This can be clearly illustrated: there is a bhikkhu-tradition that before keeping the almsbowl under the bed a bhikkhu should grope first with his hand (to see that there is no obstruction) and then put it away. This points clearly to the fact that the legs of the bed are short, (at most, eight sugata-fingers high) for one who is seated (on the floor) cannot see under the bed. If the bedlegs are high, it will be unnecessary to grope for if there was anything which would knock against the almsbowl, it could be seen.



To determine the sugatapamāṇa is not easy. The late Somdetch Phra Mahā Samana Chao made the decision to take the average height of men in the Buddha-time and this amounted to four forearms-length or *sork*, as the standard. He thought that the sugatapamāṇa of carpenters's measure multiplied by three was probably misunderstood by the Atthakathā Ācariyas. But perhaps the sugatapamāṇa should be divided by three so he tried to calculate it as follows: he divided the carpenter's handspans into three parts—each part having four carpenters fingers, and to these parts he added one more part, becoming thus four parts, equal to 16 carpenters fingers.\* This is assumed to be the sugata-handspan. By reducing the calculation in this way, the bed-legs become short and agree with the statement that a bhikkhu should grope (under the bed before putting away his bowl). This also agrees with the size of the cīvāra used: namely, six sork in length and four sork in width. According to this calculation, the Master's body should be 128 fingers tall, or 5 sork + 8 fingers both of carpenters' measure. But I do not understand, or have not found enough evidence, why the late Somdetch Phra Mahā Samana Chao regarded 129 carpenters-fingers as the height of the Master, in his book, "Sugatavidatthi Pakarana".

The method of calculating the sugatapamāṇa as suggested by him, was multiplying by 129. The measurement given in the sikkhāpada is divided by 96 and the result will be in carpenters measurement (vattakīpamāṇa). For the spreading of the fraction it should be divided by 96 so that the result will be the fraction of carpenters-measure. But according to this calculation, one kabiet is divided into four anukabiet.

The sugatapamāṇa as calculated by the late Somdetch Phra Mahā Samana Chao Krom Phrayā Pavaresvariyaṇkarana was thus made shorter than the Atthakathā method, thus agreeing better with the evidence. Perhaps, before the time of the Atthakathā, this calculation was current. But when the size of people of the same age and country are compared, then the Master would

\* Thus instead of multiplying by three, adding one third. (Translators).

have been much bigger, namely, one forearm and one hand-span higher than them, and then King Ajātasattu should have recognized Him. If this was a possibility for the Master, then Phra Mahākassapa and Phra Nanda must also have been approximately the same height. When it is like this, with a vast difference in height, it cannot be regarded as a marvellous characteristic of the Master alone! It should be regarded as the differences between the people of that country. However, it is still too big.

Could there be some way for considering how to shorten this? I can see only one way. According to this subject in the Vibhaṅga, in the original story prohibiting bhikkhus from wearing the sugatacivara, Phra Nanda was four fingers shorter than the Master. This could be the basis for calculation. We know that Phra Nanda was a handsome man, so if his height was equal to normal people, the Master must have stood four fingers higher than him. Because of the word 'handsome', it seems probable that he was a little taller than the ordinary people, so what was his height? Four fingers as said already were the basis in the Vibhaṅga so according to this the Master was eight fingerbreadths higher than the common people. This will be considerably better (than other calculations). When we take the average of four and eight, we have six fingerbreadths, as the middle measurement. But at first we have to accept that four forearms-length or sork make up the height of the ordinary people, otherwise we have no way to consider further. By adding 6 fingerbreadths to 96 fingerbreadths we get 102 fingerbreadths or 4 sork + 6 fingerbreadths. This was the height of the Master. The method of calculating the sugatapamāna is to shorten the standard taking 17 as the sugata-basis for multiplication and taking 16 carpenters-basis for division. According to this way of calculation, there is not much difference, for example, the eight sugata-fingerbreadths of bed-legs are equal to eight fingers plus two kabiet of the carpenters-fingers.



This however, makes for difficulties otherwise one may say that there is no way to consider it definitely. I should like to suggest that sugatapamāṇa as worked out by the late Somdet Phra Mahā Samāṇa Chao Krom Phrayā Pavaresvariya-lāṅkarana which has been accepted by all at present, is greater than the measure used in our country now, even though calculation has shortened it. Therefore, one can use any unit of measurement, namely the English foot, the carpenters-forearm, the individual's fingerbreadth, or the metre. In the last of these, 25 cm [a part divided from 100] are compared to one kheup or handspan, that is, 12 fingerbreadths but will not exceed a sugatapamāṇa so one should not be doubtful. According to my way of calculation, the foot-measurement should not be used because it is too long; the carpenters-forearm and the (parts of the) metre are proper for use. There is not much discrepancy between the latter two. One should not be troubled to calculate it. Either of these two can be used but the carpenters-forearm measure has no fixed standard. In the future, if the country will fix the standard of measurement for sure, the metric standard should rather be used, as used in many countries. It is commonly regarded as a sure method because it takes the diameter of the world as its standard and it can be compared with our carpenters-forearm, with little discrepancy. One metre can be compared with two sork, so  $\frac{1}{2}$  metre or 50 cm are about 1 sork or forearm, while 25 cms are about 1 kheup or handspan. Other measures such as wāh and sen (= 20 wāh) can be calculated against the metric measure accordingly. If one knows how to use the metre making comparison to get the measurement as one requires, it will be convenient in every way.

Furthermore, regarding the Magadha-nāli used in Magadha at that time, it was explained in a very complicated way. This term does not come in the mātikā, that is, in the training-rules. It was only said in the Vibhaṅga that the middle-sized almsbowl can contain boiled rice from one nāli of raw grain. In the Atthakathā, it is said that a Magadha-nāli is meant. If we

consider that the Vibhaṅga was composed in Magadha state, or understand further that the Sangāyanas took place there, the explanation about the Magadha nālī being meant must be right, for when a calculation is given, the measures used as standards in that country will be used. I shall not trouble myself with this point and continue no further. According to the Sinhalese Ācariyas' assumption,  $1\frac{1}{2}$  nālī of the Sinhalese nālī equals one Magadha-nālī and when the Magadha-nālī was of large size, it is proper to use the nālī which has been mentioned in the capacity-measurement for measuring the quantity of raw grain to be cooked for determining the size of a bowl.

---

(The translators request the co-operation of readers in reporting errors that they may find in this book. The Thai text is difficult in some places and the modes of expression are sometimes very terse). Translators.



May all the efforts made in  
the translation and production  
of this book by all who have  
helped with it, be dedicated  
to the Venerable Royal Author.





### **Buddhist Books from Mahamakut.**

*The Pāṭimokkha*, 227 Fundamental Rules of a Bhikkhu, with Introduction by Phra Sāsana Sobhana (Suvaddhano) and the Pāli page by page with English translation by Ven. Nyānamoli Thera. King Mahāmakuta's Academy, 2513/1970. pp 167. Bt 30 (hard), Bt 23 (soft cover).

*"Ordination Procedure"*; by His Royal Highness the late Sangharāja of Siam, Prince Vajirañānavarorasa. Pāli texts in roman script with English translation of the Higher Ordination (or Upasampadā) and chapters explaining the basis of the Vinaya (Discipline), some rules necessary for the bhikkhu, passages for chanting, etc. King Mahāmakuta's Academy 2506/1963. pp 114. Bt 10, 4/6d.

*"Sāmaṇerasikkha—The Novice's Training"*, compiled from Pāli Texts and Commentaries with explanations by His Royal Highness, the late Sangharāja of Siam, Prince Jinavarasirivaddhana. Pāli Texts in roman script with English translation. With a "Brief biography of the Venerable Rāhula, the first Sāmaṇera", by Bhikkhu Khantipālo. King Mahāmakuta's Academy 2509/1967. pp. 53. Bt 6, 2/6d.

*"Brief Advice"* to those wishing to go forth to Homelessness as Buddhist Monks. Eight points for earnest consideration. King Mahamakuta's Academy 2511/1968. pp. 24. Bt 1.50, 8d.